

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
401	1	Your link for material requests on your website does not work.	During the public comment period, the Lead Agencies thanked the commenter for alerting them to this omission and fixed the problem.
401	2	There is no material request phone number on your website.	A general, toll-free hotline number, 866-924-9955 has been on the website since 2010. All requests can be made via this phone number.
403	1	The proposal to build two giant tunnels under the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta is the most outrageous, environmentally harmful and destructive idea that has ever been suggested yet in California's ongoing effort to find a solution to our water problems. The diversion at approximately two thirds of the Sacramento River's flow away from the Delta would cause incalculable harm to the whole environment of the Delta, the estuary and San Francisco Bay. What are you who support this proposal thinking? It boggles the mind!	Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. The plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. The project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole. The environmental documentation and project approval will be acted on by the decision makers from each lead agency at the conclusion of the environmental planning processes for both CEQA and NEPA.
403	2	The money it would cost to build these tunnels would much better be spent on desalinization projects for Southern California's urban consumption, development/enhancement of local sources and improved conservation strategies for agriculture in the San Joaquin Valley.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. For more information regarding alternatives to the proposed project please see Master Response 4.
403	3	The whole notion that we can or should export water to Southern California from the northern watersheds, water which is in demand and not sufficient to meet local needs, is absurd! We must learn to conserve, recycle waste water and live within our means! Stop this nonsense!	The Proposed Project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the Proposed Project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta. 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/ .

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<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>
404	1	<p>I'm a Branch Chief in DWR's Northern Region Office. The following statement from the BDCP EIR/EIS was brought to my attention via an email from one of our local environmental groups.</p> <p>"The Sacramento Valley Groundwater Basin is 'full' in most areas, except during droughts and in a few locales where drawdown has been observed over the years. In most areas groundwater levels recover to pre-irrigation season levels each spring."</p> <p>The above statement characterizing the Sacramento Valley Groundwater Basin as being "full" in most areas is not accurate. Our work on the CWP 2013 Update indicates that groundwater storage in the Sacramento Valley groundwater basin was reduced by approximately 700-1,700 TAF, between 2005 and 2010. In many areas of the Sacramento Valley groundwater levels are at all-time lows and preliminary information from our Spring 2014 groundwater level measurements indicate that groundwater level declines are continuing.</p> <p>Please correct the above statement in the BDCP EIR/EIS or provide the information source so we can follow-up. The BDCP page number associated with the above statement wasn't provided.</p>	<p>The information in the paragraph referenced in this comment was based upon information from the 2009 California Water Plan Update. The 2013 California Water Plan Update actually increased the volume of groundwater pumped from 2,585,000 acre-ft in 2009 to 2,742,900 acre-ft. The 50,000 acre-foot increase in groundwater pumping related to the Project would still represent less than a 2% increase in groundwater pumping.</p> <p>The word "full" in quotation marks was meant to indicate that the amount within Sacramento Valley groundwater basin is generally adequate to meet groundwater uses. The statement was not meant to indicate that it was literally at full capacity.</p>
406	1	<p>Issuing incidental take permits is not environmentally friendly. Can't you even read what you are writing? Anybody dumb enough to believe this twin tunnel does anything but wreck the SF Bay and the Delta is a retard. Removing water from the SF Bay and the Delta will hurt the Bay and the Delta, not help it. 1.3 gigabytes of reports that no doubt cost millions to write can't change less water = less wildlife.</p>	<p>The Lead Agencies respectfully disagree with the general assertion that the documentation is fundamentally flawed or "that issuing incidental take permits is not environmentally friendly" as stated by the commenter. For more discussion on permitting, the commenter is referred to Master Response 8. The commenter is also referred to the following Master Responses: Master Response 31 (Compliance with Delta Reform Act), Master Response 11 (Applicability of City and County General Plans), Master Response 13 (Public Trust Doctrine), and Master Response 5 (Compliance with ESA). Furthermore, the preparation and processing of the documentation are in compliance with state and federal environmental laws and regulations. For example, documentation generated by this proposed project has undergone extensive public and scientific input, discussion, and transparency, including the posting of administrative draft chapters online and providing many more opportunities for public participation than is normally required by the CEQA/NEPA processes (see Master Response 41 [Transparency]). Since 2006, the BDCP and subsequently the California WaterFix Project have been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. Refer to Chapter 32 (Public Involvement, Consultation, and Coordination) in the Draft EIR/EIS and Master Response 40 (Public Outreach Adequacy). The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. The Final EIR/EIS is intended to provide sufficient CEQA and NEPA support for approval of the proposed project or any of the action alternatives for either compliance strategy. In turn, applicable permits and approvals from public agencies other than the Lead Agencies will be sought while relying on the Final EIR/EIS. These other public agencies are referred to as responsible agencies and trustee</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			agencies under CEQA (State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15381 and 15386) and cooperating agencies under NEPA (e.g., USACE and EPA). These agencies will make their own findings on the merit of the project and approved mitigation, while conditioning their approvals, as required.
406	2	Brown, Feinstein, and Boxer are selling their liberal bay area base of support down the river. They are getting their campaigns financed by the State water contractors".	This process has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State of California as a whole. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS documentation were raised.
406	3	<p>We are going to spend 50-100 billion dollars to give Resnick and his buddies water at \$7.50 an acre foot to store in huge underground lakes so they can grow "wonderful" pistachios or sell the water back to us at \$750 an acre foot.</p> <p>It is totally disgusting to watch this all unfold. To see our government giving away billions to the richest and then cutting everything imaginable that would go to the poorest. The worst part is having to listen to these "State Water Contractors" bitch about how the government is the problem when they are ones sucking down by far the most government money. It is worse than seeing a welfare mother cuss out a school principle when her kid gets free lunches, free healthcare, and free school. If the government did not build the State Water Project or the Central Valley Project, then there would be no such thing as a "State Water Contractor". It's not as if these guys built all the dams and canals themselves. We are giving them the water.</p>	<p>For more information regarding funding of the proposed project please see Master Response 5.</p> <p>The construction of the water delivery facilities is estimated to cost \$14.9 billion, an amount that would be paid for by the state and federal water contractors who rely on Delta exports. The range of costs for water varies widely among contractors south of the Delta. Costs depend on the source of water, transport facilities, energy requirements, among other factors. For the agricultural customers of the CVP, prices range from \$100 per acre-foot to more than \$400 per acre-foot. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, which buys water from the SWP, estimates that the cost of the proposed project would translate into about \$5.00 extra per household, per month in its service area. The final cost of water from the new conveyance facilities would be determined by numerous factors. A number of these significant factors, such as the project yield and allocation of costs, have yet to be determined. Please see Master Response 5 for more information regarding costs of implementation and regarding funding of the proposed project.</p>
408	1	These massive and expensive tunnels will destroy farmland and publicly funded conservation land, adversely impact already threatened and endangered fish and wildlife like sandhill cranes, and drain already strained northern reservoirs and rivers. Huge amounts of water will no longer go through the Delta, so any attempted restoration or offsets will be useless and wasted. Please do not waste our money and destroy our rivers and wildlife.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, EIR/EIS, identifies several mitigation measures that are intended to avoid, reduce, and/or minimize the effects on agricultural resources in the Delta. Please see Master Response 18 for additional information regarding agricultural impacts and mitigation as proposed in the BDCP and EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The Lead Agencies are unaware of any information suggesting that these new habitat areas would lack sufficient water to achieve success, as the commenter indicates. Though the activities associated construction of the new conveyance infrastructure would cause some impacts, the EIR/EIS contains environmental commitments and mitigation measures to reduce significant and adverse effects to the extent feasible. For additional discussion on the habitat restoration and enhancement activities included in the proposed BDCP, please see Master Response 5.</p> <p>The proposed project and its alternatives analyzed in the EIR/S do not include any regulatory action that would reduce the protections for water right holders other than the SWP and CVP. The proposed project aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented BDCP would be about the same as average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Please see Master Response 26 for additional information on effects on northern California. Please see Master Response 5 for additional detail on the BDCP and the alternatives involving an HCP component. 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 only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html).
409	1	The BDCP will provide more operational flexibility including more wet season exports. Currently wet season exports are curtailed due to delta smelt impacts. But we have no idea what the impact of operational flexibility will be on northern counties.	<p>Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 8 evaluated in the EIR/EIS decrease monthly total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase flows in the winter months when the river flows are high. A summary of the impacts of these alternatives as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative are presented in the Executive Summary, Section ES.9, Comparisons of the Alternatives, EIR/EIS. More detailed information is provided in each resource-specific chapter of the EIR/EIS. For example, long-term average flows in the Sacramento River flows at Freeport under Alternative 4H4 could be up to 3 percent higher in June and 5 percent lower in January as compared to the No Action Alternative (as shown in Table C-20.20 of Appendix 5A, Section C, EIR/EIS).</p> <p>Storage in CVP and SWP reservoirs upstream of the Delta would be less under No Action Alternative and other EIR/EIS alternatives as compared to Existing Conditions (as summarized in Figures C-1-1 through C-4-2 and Figures C-6-1 and C-6-2 in Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Modeling Results). Similarly, CVP water deliveries to North of Delta Agricultural Water Service Contractors would be less under No Action Alternative and other EIR/EIS alternatives as compared to Existing Conditions (as summarized in Figure C-13-1). As shown in these figures, storage and CVP North of Delta agricultural water service contract deliveries would be similar, greater, or less than the No Action Alternative depending upon the alternative. As shown in Figure C-13-3, CVP water deliveries to North of Delta municipal and industrial water users would be greater than Existing Conditions due to the growth projections under the No Action Alternative and all EIR/EIS alternatives as compared to Existing Conditions.</p>
409	2	<p>The BDCP modeling of the late long term (2060) no action alternative shows that the combined effects of climate change (longer summer reservoir drawdown period), and sea level rise (17 inches predicted by 2060), together with unchanged Delta salinity standards, will cause northern CA reservoirs to be drawn down to dead pool levels in about 11-12% of years. (For Folsom Lake this is the level at which the cities of Folsom, and Roseville, and the San Juan water district will be unable take water from the lake.)</p> <p>If action is taken, and the BDCP is implemented, will it do anything to prevent or minimize this impact? Will it not potentially increase this risk by allowing more continuous export of water south of the Delta, while northern reservoirs are drained to meet unchanged Delta salinity standards?</p>	This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach. A modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where the comments focused on elements of the BDCP that overlap with the elements of Alternatives 2D, 4A, or 5A (e.g., CM1 as it comprises of the North Delta Diversions, tunnels, and supporting facilities), specific responses are presented. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA's requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Where comments submitted on the BDCP were focused on elements outside the scope of the environmental analysis or viability of the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives within the context of CEQA/NEPA (e.g., request of specific revisions to the BDCP related to mapping or references), no specific responses are provided and further consideration will be given to these comments, and any revisions to the Draft BDCP would only be made, if an HCP/NCCP alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the CEQA/NEPA process.
409	3	Since the BDCP is based largely on the goal of returning the Delta to a more natural condition, should that not also include recognition of the fact that in its original natural condition, the delta experienced great variations of salt water incursion from season to season?	A discussion on the water quality (e.g., salinity) of the Delta, rivers, and bay can be found in Section 8.2.1.6 (Water Quality Objectives and Criteria) of the Draft EIR/EIS. These objectives and criteria must be considered within the framework of the co-equal goals mandated through the Delta Reform Act, the purpose and need of the proposed project, and the restoration goals for the Delta's ecosystem. While emphasizing historic variations in saltwater intrusion in the Delta may provide further understanding of the Delta's natural

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			condition to the public and decision makers, it is not the intent of the project to return the Delta to its original condition. Instead, the project would provide more reliability in the State's water supply, as well having that water supply meet applicable water quality requirements that maintain or improve the aquatic environment for fishes and other aquatic species.
409	4	How will decisions be made as to how much water flows where and when? Who will make those decisions?	<p>The proposed north Delta Diversion 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 (including considerations of upstream storage, snowpack, and time of year), 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 proposed project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Conservation Strategy, BDCP (page 3.4-17).</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 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>See Master Response 28 for more information regarding operational criteria.</p>
409	5	What checks and balances will be established to prevent any particular region or interest group from disenfranchising another?	The institutional structure and organizational arrangements that will be established to govern and implement the project are described in Chapter 7, Implementation Structure, 2013 Draft EIR/EIS. The implementation structure is designed to ensure that sufficient institutional expertise, capacity, resources, and focus are brought to bear to accomplish the goals and objectives of the project, that the entities receiving regulatory authorizations are accountable to those agencies granting the regulatory authorizations, and that the decision-making process regarding the implementation of the Plan is transparent and understandable to the public. There are a number of regulatory mechanisms in place that should prevent undue impacts in the Delta due to water exports that would occur under the project. For example, the project must operate within the requirements of the Water Quality Control Plan for the Bay Delta Region. This document, which is revised periodically, ensures that the SWP operates in a manner that does not result in exceedances of water quality objectives intended to protect various beneficial uses of water within the Delta. Another protection relates to the water rights framework in California law. When DWR and Reclamation seek permission from the State Water Resources Control Board for new points of diversion on the Sacramento River, the State Board will have to consider the potential for injury to other water users, as well as the public interest, before granting such approvals. More fundamentally, the agencies being asked to approve the project – the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Marine Fisheries Service, and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife – will not approve the project unless they are convinced that sufficient flows will be available in the lower Sacramento River and Delta to contribute to the recovery and conservation of listed aquatic species. These flows will incidentally benefit river recreation and some downstream water users.
409	6	What will prevent de-watering of some areas to benefit other areas? (As happened to the Owens Valley.)	The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor include any regulatory actions that would affect water rights holders other than DWR, Reclamation, and SWP and CVP contractors.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Importantly, all water exported by the SWP and CVP is subject to the existing water rights of those two agencies. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives analyzed in the EIR/EIS only include the use of water from existing SWP and CVP water rights or voluntary water transfers from other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders.</p> <p>The proposed project's facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants, would be operated in accordance with permits issued by, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the State Water Resources Control Board, among other agencies. The proposed project would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>Through the Legislature and through executive agencies, California has embraced water conservation on numerous fronts, as have many California water agencies. Many of these efforts are highlighted in Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, which describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply, including recycled water. While these elements are not proposed as part of the project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. It is important to note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage.</p> <p>For more information regarding alternatives development, water demand management, and purpose and need please see Master Response 4, Master Response 6, and Master Response 3.</p>
410	1	<p>I was at a meeting last week where a rep from the Placer County Water Agency spoke about the BDCP.</p> <p>If I understood him correctly, he said that the BDCP anticipates or forecasts that if the BDCP is implemented (twin tunnels, etc), Folsom Lake will very likely be drained to dead pool level in one out of 10 years. By dead pool he meant it would be so low that whatever water was left in it would not be useable by local agencies.</p> <p>Could you comment on this?</p>	<p>As shown in Chapter 5, Figure 5-12, Folsom Lake End of September Storage, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS, the proposed project does not increase the frequency of "dead pool" conditions in the Folsom Lake compared to the No Action Alternative. The increased occurrences of "dead pool" conditions in the future either with or without the proposed project are primarily attributable to sea level rise, climate change and higher demands associated with water rights (primarily in El Dorado, Placer, and Sacramento counties), and not due to proposed project.</p>
411	1	<p>Hi I am trying to find the following document on the BDCP EIS/EIR docs website but the link does not seem to be working. Would you be able to help me resolve this issue?</p> <p>Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS Appendix 3A - Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1</p>	<p>During the public comment period, the Lead Agencies thanked the commenter for alerting them to this omission and fixed the problem.</p>
412	1	<p>My husband and I have lived in Discovery Bay on the San Joaquin River for 10 years. It took us 40 yrs of working to be able to afford the life-style on the water. We love boating, fishing and skiing. The tunnel proposal would ruin our property value, deplete the fishing industry and worst of all, Further lessen the water quality of Discovery Bay.</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). Additionally, the commenter does not offer any further evidence on how the project would "ruin our property value, deplete the fishing industry and worst of all, further lessen the water quality of Discovery Bay" that hasn't already been addressed in the environmental documentation.</p>
412	2	<p>In the 1970's during California's last drought, we lived in Antioch. Salt intrusion into the water system measured 360 ppm from 60 ppm. Is that healthy? Of course not. But the</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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>acceptable standard was immediately changed to correspond with 360. Past history says of salt intrusion will repeat itself. There is no accountably for cost or what the true cost will be to the taxpayers. What happens in dry years? Who gets the water? Do we all get reduced or only the private users? Why deprive present and future Californians of necessary water to be able to ship alfalfa, almonds and other agricultural products overseas for the profit of large growers. The products are grown in salt-based desert. The more water that goes to these crops, the more salt surfaces, and the more water is needed to get rid of the salt. The tax payers should not pay for large agricultural growers. The California's agriculture uses 80 percent of the state's water supply.</p>	<p>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>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 beneficial use please see Master Response 34.</p> <p>For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.</p>
412	3	<p>The tunnels would deplete Northern California's water supply. There is not more water to be produced. Where would the big grower go the Delta water is not healthy? They wouldn't stay in California. Don't kill the goose that is laying the golden egg. California needs to build water storage, re do the levees that deliver the water and practice rationing.</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 Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats.</p> <p>The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well.</p> <p>The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/.</p> <p>Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7 regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage.</p>
413	1	I oppose the tunnels because there is water already being sent south. Water conservation, infrastructure, desalination plants and environmental issues need to be addressed and explored.	<p>The Proposed Project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the Proposed Project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p> <p>For more information regarding alternatives to the proposed project please see Master Response 4.</p>
414	1	<p>Last week Leslie Katz, SF Port Commissioner, came to my Rotary Club and spoke to us about the Bay Delta Conservation Plan ("BDCP") and did a little Q&A afterwards.</p> <p>My understanding of the BDCP is that (1) there are basically two parts to the Plan: (a) water tunnels built and (b) wildlife conservation projects, which, by law, the wildlife conservation projects need to be completed for this BDCP to be legal; (2) the communities that benefit from the water tunnels being built are paying for the water tunnels but they are not being held financially responsible for the wildlife conservation projects, but the State of California is responsible for paying for the wildlife conservation part of the BDCP; (3) funds for the wildlife conservation plan do not have to be secured before the tunnels are built, and it is hoped that bond measures and other funding will work out.</p> <p>Based on my understanding of the BDCP, I am opposed to the tunnel part of the BDCP starting before funds have been secured for the wildlife conservation part of the BDCP. In other words, until funds have been secured for the full project (tunnels + wildlife conservation), the project should be a no-go. This is just basic business commonsense.</p> <p>Too many times do we see projects being undertaken and the funding run out before it can be completed. It is easy to imagine the tunnels being built and the wildlife projects not happening because of lack of funding.</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>For more information regarding cost of the proposed project please see Master Response 5.</p> <p>For more information regarding funding of the proposed project please see Master Response 5.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
415	1	I live here in Oakley, CA off of Cypress Avenue in Summerlake community. We are an HOA community. In our CCR it tells us that we do have a back-up supply of water, but it will be filled with magnesium turning the water brown. If they do the tunnels down to the Central Valley, and we have a water shortage like we have right now, our community here at Summerlake will have to be drinking and showering in brown water. Please do not let this happen. The State now has enough money where they can tunnel the water in from out of state. Please ask the State to use the reserve funds we now have for such an emergency as this will be.	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's proposed dual conveyance facilities would allow water to be moved through the Delta when conditions permit, and allow water to be diverted from the Sacramento River in the northern Delta when conditions in the south Delta do not permit diversions from the existing SWP and CVP facilities. The location of the north Delta diversion facility is less vulnerable to salinity intrusion, a potential impact of sea level rise, or levee failure, in the future. By establishing an alternative diversion point for exports, a great deal of water management flexibility is added. This added flexibility would provide more options for adaptively managing the Delta so that conditions can be optimized to provide the greatest benefits across all Delta water uses and habitat conditions. For a description of the process the Lead Agencies followed to develop and screen alternatives, refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives Development). With regards to "tunnel the water in from out of state," this proposal would not meet the Purpose and Need (Master Response 3) or comply with the co-equal goals of the Delta Reform Act (Master Response 31). For information on water quality impacts, refer to Chapter 8 in the Draft EIR/EIS and Section 4/Appendix A (Chapter 8) in the FinalEIR/EIS.
416	1	If you really want to help the Delta, stop letting all the cities that dump sewage into it from doing business as usual. Use the water from Hetch Hetchy to add volume to the Delta and restrict water usage of large metro cities for drinking and cooking so central California farmers can feed them! California water laws are archaic and need to be changed now before the farming communities are turned into ghost towns! Our economy hangs in the balance. When I go to San Francisco, Los Angeles or Sacramento and see water running on lawns and down the streets, it makes me sick. Farmers are the very best at conservation and are the only people that actually help recharge groundwater and yet, year after year, new laws and penalties are thrown at them. Well, I say if you love foreign oil you are going to be ecstatic over foreign food. I wonder how many people will die when this reality starts to come into play! Hope all you water people will be the first to go.	<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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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>
417	1	<p>Water management in the State of California is dysfunctional and needs repair. I agree with the UC Davis Center for Watershed Science as they posted on CaliforniaWaterBlog.com</p> <p>(http://californiawaterblog.com/2014/01/07/resistance-is-futile-inevitable-changes-to-water-management-in-california/):</p> <p>(1) Some few western Delta islands should be flooded and restored, (2) water diversions from the Delta must be reduced, (3) the Tulare and San Joaquin River Basins are over-cultivated, are depleting ground- and surface water and in some areas soils leach selenium - some of this land should be bought out and fallowed and remaining agriculture must have regulated water use (4) urban areas must use less water - Los Angeles and San Francisco may be down to 150 gpcd, but Hillsborough and Holmby Hills certainly are not. There is still tons of waste. (5) UC Davis cites Peter Moylin in predicting some extinctions may be inevitable - here I disagree and agree with Peter Moyle's own prescriptions (posted on February 17, 2014 by UC Davis Center for Watershed Sciences on http://californiawaterblog.com/): more dams need removing, more Delta channels need restoring, commercial fishing needs to stop taking the oldest biggest and most productive fish and hatcheries need to maintain populations with stream-specific fidelity.</p> <p>(6) Water supplies must become more local. (7) Regulations must be effective. (8) Groundwater quality needs greater protection. (9) Groundwater quantity needs protection. (10) The Salton Sea should be abandoned and the Colorado River Delta should be restored. What is needed is a statewide revision of water management, not a pair of tunnels.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The 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>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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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>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>
419	1	<p>The Farm Bureau Delta Caucus represents the five farm bureaus within the Delta. Agriculture is the main economy in the Delta and production is deeply woven in to the fabric of the community with many incidental businesses in the region sustained by crop production. Because agriculture is so essential to the Delta, we have expressed our concerns regarding the Bay-Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) and the effects it may have on water quality, the amount of prime agriculture lost to construction and mitigation, and how this will affect the Delta community, economically or otherwise.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the answers to these questions are buried in 34,000 pages of information. The EIR and EIS for the BDCP are highly detailed, technical reports that need to be first filtered, and second understood. The time period to both read and analyze the environmental documents is not reasonable. We respectfully request an additional one hundred and twenty (120) days to review these documents.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 39 which provides additional information on the Public Review period.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		The addition of more time will allow us to give these documents the attention necessary considering the scope of this project. The ability of any agency to provide thoughtful comments on this plan considering the too short comment period and the voluminous documents is nil. The public comment period is a necessary part of the public process that is particularly important in this instance considering the magnitude of impacts the BDCP will have on the Delta community that are apparent without so much as a cursory glance to the environmental documents.	
419	2	The planning process of the BDCP has left much to be desired in the way of transparency. The open house events are designed to further confuse the public by offering bit of pieces of the project at different stations rather than offering a comprehensive overview of the project in a seminar form that would better inform and include members of the community.	Please refer to Master Responses 40 and 41 for information related to outreach, transparency of the planning process and stakeholder engagement.
419	3	The refusal by the state to release comments as they are received is a blatant attempt to stifle the public comment period instead of encouraging participation.	<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 or releasing comments as they are received is not a requirement of or a standard practice for CEQA or NEPA processes.</p>
419	4	Our concerns remain that the BDCP will have a detrimental effect on water quality within the Delta, and the construction, mitigation, and habitat projects will remove valuable agricultural land from production and subsequently and businesses and community will suffer.	<p>This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach. A modified proposed project, 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 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.</p> <p>.</p> <p>Water quality impacts are discussed in Chapter 8, Water Quality, EIR/EIS. Where significant environmental impacts have been identified, mitigation measures have been proposed to avoid, reduce, and minimize those impacts to the extent feasible. For an overview of water quality effects, please see Master Response 14.</p> <p>Economic effects related to conversion of agricultural lands, including employment, are described in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, EIR/EIS. Under the proposed BDCP (Alternative 4), the chapter estimates that, during construction, there would be a total employment reduction equivalent of 57 full-time positions, including direct and indirect effects. Following the construction of the water conveyance facilities, there would be a lasting reduction of 41 full-time equivalent positions related to agriculture. Because this count includes direct, indirect, and induced employment, it is likely that these effects would be spread out throughout the five county Delta region. Although activities related to construction and implementation of all land-intensive conservation measures will reduce agricultural positions and income, they will also create substantial employment in other sectors. New jobs associated with construction and operation and maintenance would be added to the region, which could offset localized reductions in population. The Job Creation & Protection Fact Sheet reports that a total of 19,973 jobs will be directly created by construction and maintenance of water conveyance facilities under the BDCP (a full-time equivalent job is defined for the</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			purposes of the fact sheet as one person working full-time for one year).
419	5	We respectfully request that the state extend the comment period at least another 120 days and release the comments on the EIR/ EIS as they are received.	Please see Master Response 39.
420	1	The Draft EIR/EIS appears well documented and supported by factual and scientific based data. The focus on conservation and rebuilding the habitats for endangered species while allowing for removal of water from the Sacramento River Delta is thorough and considers several alternatives with their associated costs. While the need for conservation and habitat mitigation is sound and well researched, what does not appear to be addressed is the justification for or the actual demand for removal of water to meet stakeholder needs. Specifically, this document should include a detailed analysis of the current and future needs of agribusiness and municipal water districts together with current supplies. It should also include a review of the capacity of the Delta Mendota Aqueduct as well as the other delivery conduits for each stakeholder. In addition, the capacity of the various tunnel and forebay options should be reviewed in light of these demands and existing conveyances south of the Delta to justify the logic and consistency of the total water delivery system to become part of the expanded State Water Project. These questions were asked during the public meetings last summer but were neither answered during the meetings nor during follow up email requests.	Chapter 30, Section 30.1.3, Urban Land Use and Water Use by Hydrologic Region, 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS, describes long-term water demand in the hydrologic regions based on projections from the California Water Plan. The chapter goes on to compare the modeled changes in deliveries associated with alternatives to the projected changes in future demand in order to evaluate the potential for the proposed project implementation to remove obstacles to growth. The proposed project does not propose any change to storage or conveyance capacity of facilities outside of the Plan Area. Thus, water diverted from new north Delta facilities would find its way into existing facilities.
420	2	An area that is not addressed in the Draft EIR/EIS is if any substantive analysis has been done to determine the feasibility of reducing current and future demand by the stakeholders through comprehensive conservation measures. We have all heard and seen the examples of poor usage and wastage of water by residential users statewide. While many municipal water districts have instituted programs of incentives to encourage home owners to install low volume toilets and restricting shower heads, no substantive measures have been undertaken to limit water usage for residential irrigation. What impact could this have on demand? It seems that DWR has an opportunity to develop a highly effective standard for reducing wastage by instituting requirements of stakeholders through the SWP and setting the bar for other major municipal water districts that obtain water from other sources.	<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>
420	3	Overall, it appears that the Draft EIR/EIS starts with the apparent acceptance that the demand for water now and in the future has been justified and the need has been clearly	Please see Master Response 6 regarding water demand management and Appendix 1C, Demand

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		quantified. More work is needed to fill in this serious gap in the document.	<p>Management Measures, EIR/EIS, for information regarding demand management.</p> <p>Estimates for demand used in CALSM II and DSM2 modeling were based on SWP and CVP water supply allocations and federal and state regulations. Assumptions for future demands in the Sacramento Valley were based on projected land use development. As is discussed in EIR/EIS Chapter 30, Growth Inducement and Other Indirect Effects, the analysis does not simply assume that each “hydrologic region” will experience increased demand between the present and 2060, but instead looks at the specific conditions facing particular region, finding that in some of them water demand may actually go down or stabilize in the future, while in others demands will likely increase substantially. For more information regarding water demand assumptions used in modeling, see Appendix 5A, Section B, CALSIM II and DSM2 Modeling Simulations and Assumptions. Operations of Conservation Measure 1 would be governed by the criteria described in Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives, EIR/EIS, which include elements related to water quality and bypass flows in the north Delta. See Master Response 28 for additional information.</p>
421	1	<p>As stated in the BDCP and Draft EIR/EIS Section 19.1.3 (Transportation), the BDCP will be implemented within an important marine commerce area, including the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel (DWSC), which terminates at the Port. Infrastructure maintenance and navigation improvements at the Port and within the Stockton DWSC are routine and critical for supporting vital marine commerce. The Port partners with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to implement annual maintenance dredging, and is the local sponsor for the San Francisco Bay to Stockton Navigation Improvement Study, which evaluates planned navigation improvements in the channel</p> <p>The BDCP and Draft EIR/EIS appear to exclude from their analyses the current efforts underway to deepen the Stockton DWSC as well as the ongoing need to maintain and operate dredged material placement sites for routine USACE and Port maintenance dredging programs. As such, the Port believes that it is important to acknowledge these potential impacts in both the BDCP and associated EIR/EIS, as well as for the BDCP implementing agencies to work with the Port and USACE to proactively plan for these efforts alongside proposed BDCP actions.</p>	<p>The Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel is described in Appendix 3D in Existing Conditions and under Cumulative Impact Assumptions. However, at the time that modeling assumptions for the BDCP EIR/EIS were being developed, the San Francisco Bay to Stockton Navigation Improvement Study was not described at a level of detail adequate to identify whether or to what extent it might contribute to cumulative effects when considered in conjunction with effects caused by BDCP and its alternatives. The lead agencies will work with the Port and USACE to proactively plan for efforts to deepen the channel and ongoing need to maintain and operate dredge material sites alongside proposed project actions.</p>
421	2	<p>The Port of Stockton is specifically concerned with the assumption in the BDCP that no new navigation deepening projects will occur in the region. As noted above, the Port and USACE are currently completing the San Francisco Bay to Stockton Navigation Improvement Study, in which the following elements are being analyzed:</p> <p>Deepening the Stockton DWSC by 3 to 5 feet, plus allowable overdepth</p> <p>Placing dredged material at the Montezuma Wetlands Restoration Site (Montezuma)</p> <p>Restoring marsh habitat at Suisun Marsh as mitigation</p> <p>Restoring marsh habitat at Franks Tract, Big Break, and/or Little Franks Tract through beneficially reusing dredged material</p> <p>The Port understands that the BDCP and San Francisco Bay to Stockton Navigation Improvement Study could have cumulative impacts on salinity intrusion and sensitive species that need to be understood in a holistic and collaborative sense. Specific to our deepening project, the Port and USACE are actively working together and with regional experts to understand and mitigate these impacts.</p>	<p>As described in Appendix 3D, Defining Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and Cumulative Impact Conditions, EIR/EIS, for the BDCP EIR/EIS, programs with specific plans identified in draft environmental and engineering documents without subsequent approvals were included in the Cumulative Impact Assumptions as reasonably foreseeable, as shown in Table 3D-7 and Table 3D-A.</p> <p>Most of the programs, projects, and policies included in the Cumulative Impact Assumptions are defined in adequate detail to estimate potential adverse and beneficial impacts, including projects with draft environmental documentation but without selection of a proposed project.</p> <p>At the time that modeling assumptions for the BDCP EIR/EIS were being developed, the San Francisco Bay to Stockton Navigation Improvement Study was not described at a level of detail adequate to identify whether or to what extent it might contribute to cumulative effects when considered in conjunction with effects caused by BDCP and its alternatives.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
421	3	<p>The Port of Stockton and United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) each own and maintain a number of upland dredged material placement sites in the vicinity of the Port and along the Stockton DWSC that are used to stockpile and beneficially reuse sediment from annual maintenance dredging of the channel. The Port and USACE have worked closely with local stakeholders to ensure the availability of these sites for use as part of ongoing maintenance dredging programs as well as by the deepening project.</p> <p>Several of the sites being considered for restoration or mitigation for the San Francisco Bay to Stockton Navigation Improvement Study are also identified in the BDCP as Restoration Opportunity Areas (ROAs). Specifically, Montezuma, Suisun Marsh, and Big Break are identified in the BDCP as part of the Suisun Marsh and West Delta ROAs (see Figure 3.2-2). The BDCP indicates that at least 7,000 acres within the Suisun Marsh ROA and 2,100 acres within the West Delta ROA would be restored to tidal habitat (see page 3.4-126). This may be an incompatible endpoint given the critical nature of these sites.</p>	<p>The Restoration Opportunity Areas are conceptual in nature. Restoration planning activities within the ROAs would occur over the permit duration and would be determined on a site-by-site basis via subsequent environmental documents. Not all lands within the ROAs would be restored through project implementation.</p>
421	4	<p>The restoration projects proposed by the BDCP would be numerous and large; over 60,000 acres of tidal wetland restoration is planned. In some areas, fill will be required to raise elevations needed for successful restoration. This element of the BDCP poses the opportunity to collaborate with other regional restoration initiatives as well as to compete with other sediment-producing projects seeking upland restoration areas.</p> <p>To ensure that the large-scale restoration efforts proposed by the BDCP can be as well-coordinated regionally as possible, we encourage the agencies developing the BDCP to work proactively with the Port and US Army of Engineers in identifying collaborative opportunities for developing restoration sites that would use dredged sediment or soils that do not interfere with ongoing maintenance and capital improvements in the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel. As such, the Port requests that the following changes be made to the BDCP:</p> <p>Please modify Chapter 3.2 to indicate that restoration activities would be coordinated with ongoing navigation improvement projects or Port activities that overlap in area or goals, or compete for resources. The chapter should specifically state that the San Francisco Bay to Stockton Navigation Improvement Study identifies Suisun Marsh and Big Break as restoration sites, and Montezuma as a beneficial reuse site for dredged material. These sites should also be removed from the Restoration Opportunity Area shown on Figure 3.2-2.</p> <p>Please indicate that the BDCP implementing authority will coordinate with the Port and USACE on any activities that could potentially affect their activities, including maintenance, navigation improvements, and vessel traffic.</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 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> <p>The comment correctly states that BDCP will require substantial fill material volumes in order to construct planned tidal marsh restoration. BDCP itself is likely to produce substantial volumes of suitable fill material, through excavation of the tunnels; in addition, many other sources of suitable fill material exist, such as deposits of dredged material, as well as fill from upland sources neighboring the Delta. No formal agreements have yet been concluded regarding regional sources and sinks for this material, but if BDCP is approved, then BDCP could enter into such agreements within the authority of the Implementation Office.</p> <p>Regarding restoration, by the end of the public review period for the Draft BDCP and its EIR/EIS, the Lead Agencies had received numerous comments on the documents from other agencies and members of the public. Many of these comments included suggestions regarding how, from the commenters' perspectives, the project could be improved. Consistent with this public input, the Lead Agencies substantially modified Alternative 4 to reduce its environmental impacts and have formulated new sub alternatives, including the proposed project, Alternative 4A, that would seek incidental take authorization for a period of far less than 50 years, and would include only limited amounts of habitat restoration.</p> <p>Although the proposed project includes only those habitat restoration measures needed to provide mitigation for specific regulatory compliance purposes, habitat restoration is still recognized as a critical component of the state's long-term plans for the Delta. Such larger endeavors, however, will likely be implemented over time under actions separate and apart from the proposed project. 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>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
421	5	<p>The San Francisco Bay to Stockton Navigation Improvement Study is listed but explicitly excluded from consideration under the existing conditions, No Action/No Project, and cumulative impact analysis in the Draft EIR/EIS (see page 3D-96 of Appendix 3D -Defining Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, No Project Alternative, and Cumulative Impact Conditions). Other navigation improvement projects are also excluded, with the exception of Suisun Bay Channel Operations and Maintenance. As such, the Port of Stockton requests that the following changes be made to the EIR/EIS:</p> <p>a. Please change Appendix 3D to indicate that the San Francisco Bay to Stockton Navigation Improvement Study is an active project that should be considered in the cumulative impact analysis. Although it is in the planning stage, it is important to acknowledge this project specifically and plan for combined</p> <p>impacts, mitigation needs, and dredged material placement site constraints and opportunities. Construction of the first phase of this project may proceed as early as 2017.</p> <p>b. In Section 19.1.3.2 (Transportation, Marine Facilities; see page 19-22), please include a more complete description of the Port's activities to acknowledge current operations, such as ongoing vessel use, maintenance activities, and planned improvements/operations.</p> <p>c. In the cumulative impact analysis, please include a description of the synergies and conflicts between ongoing navigation operations and maintenance efforts, the San Francisco Bay to Stockton Navigation Improvement Study, and BDCP activities including the following:</p> <p>Shared objectives for beneficial reuse of dredged material for habitat restoration, land subsidence reduction in Delta islands, and levee stabilization on Delta islands</p> <p>Common needs for dredged material management areas</p> <p>Cumulative salinity intrusion and sensitive species impacts</p> <p>d. Please indicate that the BDCP implementing authority will coordinate with the Port and USACE on any activities that could potentially affect their activities, including maintenance, navigation improvements, and vessel traffic.</p> <p>We appreciate your review and incorporation of our comments on the BDCP and Draft EIR/EIS. The Port suggests a meeting with your authority to share our project information and knowledge, and we are more than happy to work directly with you to implement these changes. Please let us know if you require additional clarification or information.</p>	<p>The requested changes have been made to the document. For the BDCP EIR/EIS, programs with specific plans identified in draft environmental and engineering documents without subsequent approvals were included in the Cumulative Impact Assumptions as reasonably foreseeable.</p>
423	1	<p>My Comments largely are based on the agency's BDCP Preferred Alternative (4). My recommendation is to adopt the No Project Alternative.</p> <p>NOAA, EPA, U.S. Fish & Wildlife, Calif. Resources Dept., Cal. Dept. of Fish and Game are all agencies that are supposed to base their proposals and decisions on good science and the law. However, in reading the draft EIR/EIS for the BDCP, it is clear that neither science or the law is being followed, and that if the preferred Alternative (4) is approved it will be in violation of several state and federal laws, as well as it having being passed not based on good science, but on moneyed interests and regional politics.</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p> <p>In its efforts to achieve the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem improvement, the proposed project seeks to improve conditions for species in the Delta while also securing reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California. 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 Lead Agencies have done their best to ensure that their process is based on sound science and complies with all applicable laws.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
423	2	This is not a Bay Delta Conservation Plan, for it does just the opposite to the Bay Delta by diverting massive amounts of fresh water to the Central Valley and Southern California, which instead of conserving the Bay Delta, will destroy it and also irreversibly harm Suisun Marsh and San Francisco Bay, as well.	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.
423	3	The adverse effects of the BDCP so far out-weigh any positive effects created to the end uses, that they must, by law, be rejected.	This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach. A modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. For additional detail on the primary issues being raised with regard to the BDCP or Alternative 4, as well as a discussion of the current status of the draft BDCP Effects Analysis, please see Master Response 5.
423	4	If the proposed project goes through, it will permanently and severely lower the ground-water table in the Sacramento - San Joaquin Valleys.	Chapter 7 of the Draft EIR/EIS evaluates groundwater supplies and impacts, along with Appendix A (Chapter 7) and Section 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. The plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years.
423	5	If the proposed project goes through, it will severely raise bromide levels to dangerous and unlawful levels.	Impact WQ-5 in Section 4.3.4, Water Quality, of the RDEIR/SDEIS examines the potential effects on bromide concentrations resulting from facilities operations and maintenance of the proposed project. Increases in exceedances of the 100 µg/L assessment threshold concentration for protecting against the formation of disinfection byproducts in treated drinking water would be 6% or less at all locations assessed, which is considered to be less than substantial long-term degradation of water quality. Further, the use of seasonal intakes for municipal water supply is opportunistic in the areas affected (Antioch and Mallard Island), largely driven by acceptable water quality, and opportunity to use these intakes would remain. As such, the levels of bromide degradation that may occur under the Alternative 4A would not be of sufficient magnitude to cause substantially increased risk for adverse effects on any beneficial uses of water bodies within the affected environment. Bromide is not CWA Section 303(d) listed and thus the minor increases in long-term average bromide concentrations would not affect existing beneficial use impairment because no such use impairment currently exists for bromide.
423	6	If the proposed project goes through, it will severely raise salinity to levels in the Bay Delta, Suisun Marsh and San Francisco Bay that will adversely affect Endangered and Threatened Species.	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 agricultural and fish and wildlife 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. Finally, a new Impact WQ-34 has been added to water quality assessment in Chapter 8 for all alternatives to discuss impacts to San Francisco Bay in the Final EIR/EIS.
423	7	No amount of so called mitigation can make up for the loss of millions upon millions of gallons of fresh water that will be diverted from Northern California rivers to the South, and this BDCP will have permanent adverse affects on the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta, the Suisun Marsh, and the San Francisco Bay.	The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California Water Fix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state ESAs, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Chapter 6

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			(Surface Water) of the Draft EIR/EIS and Section 4 and Appendix A (Chapter 6) of the RDEIR/SDEIS for further information on flows and flushing action. The project 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.
423	8	<p>Conclusion: By law and good science you have no option but to reject the preferred Alternative 4.</p> <p>Note: As a user of Bay Delta water, as a visitor to enjoy its fish and wildlife, as a resident of the area, these comments hereby grant me standing in case legal actions are called for, if this process is not concluded as it should be under the law.</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p> <p>The Lead Agencies are following the appropriate legal process and are complying with CEQA and NEPA in preparing the EIR/EIS. Please see response to Comment 423-1.</p>
424	1	<p>On behalf of the Glendale Association of Realtors, I am writing to express our support for the Bay Delta Conservations plan, and specifically Alternative #4 as written in the DEIR.</p> <p>There is an urgent need to both protect California's water delivery system and the ecosystem of the Delta. We believe Alternative #4 is the best answer to both.</p>	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
424	2	<p>The time for talk is past us. It is time for action on government's part to move forward with a reasonable solution that safeguards Northern California's current water supply, ensures that Southern California is not horrifically hurt from lack of water should there be an earthquake that damages the current water delivery system, and that the delicate nature of the Delta's ecosystem is restored and maintained .</p> <p>We support the BDCP, especially Alternative #4, and urge all action to move this plan toward approval and construction.</p>	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
425	1	Please know that our Chamber supports the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) and that Alternative #4, as outlined in the Draft Environmental Impact Report Environmental/Impact Statement, will serve as the best approach for addressing the current challenges with California's water supply delivery system and Delta ecosystem.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
425	2	<p>The draft plan and environmental document s identify several options, but Alternative #4 will provide:</p> <p>Three new intakes on the Sacramento River in the northern Delta</p> <p>A 9,000 cfs tunnel system to convey water to the aqueduct system</p> <p>Combining these with a comprehensive habitat conservation plan for the Delta is, in our opinion, the best alternative to meet California's co-equal goals of water supply reliability and Delta ecosystem restoration.</p>	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
425	3	It is our hope the BDCP, with Alternative #4, will lead to a final plan of action that offers the best solution to minimize seismic risk to our state's water supply infrastructure while addressing the Delta's ecosystem needs.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
427	1	<p>I was born and raised in Northern California and I take great pride in this beautiful state and that is why I am choosing to speak out against the drafted legislation BDCP.</p> <p>I currently own property on the Delta in Discovery Bay, California and the drafted EIR/EIS does not address specific issues that will impact my life, liberty and pursuit of happiness,</p>	This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach. A modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. For detailed responses on the

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		which are unalienable rights granted to every citizen of the United States and was the basis of how this country was formed in 1776.	primary issues being raised with regard to the BDCP or Alternative 4, as well as a discussion of the current status of the draft BDCP Effects Analysis, please see Master Response 5.
427	2	There is no assessment in the draft that accounts for project's impact on water quality to residents living in Discovery Bay due to the decreased flow of fresh water through the Delta. This will impact my life and the lives of numerous other people depending on the Delta for fresh water.	<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 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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			restoration areas.
427	3	The proposal also does not take into account the impact on recreational activities for those who use the Delta daily as a form of liberty and happiness. The decreased flow of water through the Delta system will create stagnant water, which will bring undesirable bacteria and potentially pose health risks to children swimming it daily. Possibly reducing recreation in the Delta is a direct assault on the liberty of the many citizens who enjoy it daily.	<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>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>
427	4	I demand that the water quality and flow in and around the Discovery Bay area be monitored and accessed in the drafted proposal.	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.
427	5	If water quality and flow were to be impacted in Discovery Bay, then home valuations would fall as a direct result in the negative impacts to the environment that this draft is not due diligently addressing. Many lawsuits would result if the legislation failed to address these types of issues. That is why I think it is in project's best interest to address these types of issues upfront, instead of trying to push half-baked legislation through.	<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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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 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> <p>When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the proposed project.</p>
427	6	<p>Apart from my own personal view, which are shared by all 15,000+ citizens in Discovery Bay, I believe there are other more compelling reasons why this project draft is completely flawed and a total waste of tax payer money.</p> <p>The most compelling reason why this project is a waste of tax payer money is that no new water will be generated as part of this project. To spend 13.5 billion dollars (assuming that is what the final cost will actually be) and create no new water in the process is a glaring flaw in the project. During a time of severe drought, the last year has shocked California and made us realize even our state, rich with natural resources, needs to better plan for the future in order to be sustainable. We should be using the 13.5 billion dollars to promote conservation and create new technology to capture and re-cycle water, rather than re-route water from point A to point B. This makes no sense, and the draft fails to address this issue in the cost/benefit analysis.</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 to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			the State of California. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.
427	7	Why would we re-route water further south to much drier farmland? Being that the Delta has rich soils due to the decades of sediment run-off the system has created it makes no sense to take the water out of this system and use it to water desert land. There needs to be a cost/benefit analysis included that addressing the re-routing of water to be used on farmland in the central and southern valleys.	<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>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>
427	8	The construction of the project that is estimated at 10-15 years conflicts directly with the Delta Plan that was adopted in 2013 to protect delta ecosystem and water quality. There needs to be an explanation made as to how this project is going to maintain the ecosystem and water quality in the delta.	The premise of the BDCP and the newly preferred alternative, the California WaterFix, is that it will provide environmental benefits while stabilizing water supplies for a large population of California residents, consistent with statutory policy as found in the Delta Reform Act of 2009 (see, e.g., California Public Resources Code, §§ 85001(c), 85002, 85004(a), 85020.) The commenter is also referred to the following Master Responses: Master Response 31 (Compliance with Delta Reform Act) and Master Response 14 (Water Quality). For more details, refer to Chapters 8 (Water Quality), 11 (Fish and Aquatic Resources), and 12 (Terrestrial Biological Resources) in the Draft EIR/EIS and in Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS. That information can then provide the commenter with sufficient information as to how this project is going to maintain the ecosystem and water quality in the Delta.
427	9	The list of reasons why the BDCP draft is completely and utterly flawed is why I am opposed to the project. I am demanding that the issues laid out in my argument above be addressed in project proposal or I do not foresee success in this project's future.	This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach. A modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. For detailed responses on the primary issues being raised with regard to the BDCP or Alternative 4, as well as a discussion of the current status of the draft BDCP Effects Analysis, please see Master Response 5.
428	1	<p>I am a plumbing contractor and I have a resolution to the problem. They are trying to tear up the Delta and make this water. We have the freshest water in the world sitting in an Alaskan ice sheet. All we have to do -- we have already two coming down with oil -- pump water down in a tube, put turbines in it, and produce energy. On that ice sheet it has sand and gravel which can be used in Alaska, and gold which you can have.</p> <p>We also have an aqueduct going all the way down to Los Angeles, and we can put turbines on top of that aqueduct and produce energy.</p> <p>The problem is down in Los Angeles, the water down there, people putting drugs into the toilets and they cannot take the drugs out of the toilets.</p> <p>We should have done this years ago and not be in the situation we are now. It's not rocket science out here, and if somebody came to me I could tell them a lot more exactly, not just</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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		in this project, but other things that are happening with our thinking, our process.	<p>management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/.</p> <p>Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7 regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage.</p>
428	2	<p>I sat in on this meeting this morning, and \$6.5 billion? I am a contractor, I know I can have water all the way from Washington, Oregon, California, Arizona, Nevada, every state, not just in the United States, we're talking the world.</p> <p>We can do this because if one of these ice sheets falls, the water levels are going to come out. We start taking that water, melting that water, putting it someplace else, we're not going to have the rising levels, it's not going to be here in California. It is New York as well.</p> <p>What Japan has done, they have been taking icebergs and making bottled water, freshest water in the world, \$25 for one bottle of water. The ice is so pure, it is pink and blue, and they make exotic drinks; they charge \$60 for a drink.</p>	<p>Please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A. Please see Master Response 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>
429	1	<p>The fundamental problem with which we are faced today regarding water resources is the mistaken sense of abundance of water based on historic experience in Northern California.</p> <p>The seeming abundance of this resource is similar in many respects to the apparent abundance of woodlands in our countries with which our early pioneers were faced. We quickly discovered the forests were not unlimited. Such is the case, unfortunately, with water resources.</p> <p>This basic fact of constant growth year over year in every area of financial and commercial endeavor, fueled by the issue of population growth, should raise a red flag regarding conservation of our most essential resource on which life depends, our water supply.</p> <p>In Governor Brown's plan, the BDCP does not require the necessary substantial revision of customary water use through significant new water recycling or desalination in coastal areas, particularly in the south end of the state.</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>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<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>For more information on potential growth effects due to project implementation please see Chapter 30 Growth Inducement and Other Indirect Effects of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A.</p>
429	2	<p>In other arid parts of the world, desalination has provided water for a thirsty populace, and as a part of a comprehensive water plan could bring new water supplies to coastal Southern California.</p> <p>As Congressman Garamendi points out, prices have dropped for technology such as this. One of those new technologies, which is much cheaper in 2014 than it was just a dozen years ago, is the power source for desalinating salt water. New ideas are emerging which show much promise.</p> <p>For example, last year saw the announcement of Carnegie Wave Energy's upcoming desalination plan near Perth, Australia. It will use the company's underwater buoy technology to harness ocean wave force to pressurize the water, cutting out the fossil fuel-powered electric pumps that usually force water through the membrane in the desalination process. The resulting system will result in a carbon-free and efficient system in terms of both energy and cost.</p> <p>I propose that the Bay Delta Conservation Plan be shelved in favor of Congressman Garamendi's approach.</p>	<p>Congressman Garamendi's Water Plan feasibility is discussed in Appendix 3A, Section 3A.11.2, Congressman Garamendi's Water Plan, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS.</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>
429	3	<p>A quick look at the water flow in the Sacramento River over the past two decades shows that approximately six months out of the year there is somewhere between fifteen and 20,000 cubic feet per second of water flowing in the Sacramento River. The BDCP proposal has the capacity to transport, as I understand it, 15,000 cubic feet per second at its maximum.</p> <p>As we know, this year in our rainy season we should be able to export water; however, this month the American River is flowing at 500 cubic feet per second, and the Sacramento River is flowing at 3,250 cubic feet per second. These rivers supply the City of Sacramento, which has just come through the driest year on record, and is looking at a snow pack which refreshes the reservoirs of just 17 percent of normal.</p> <p>The San Jose Mercury News reported on January 26th, 2014, just two days ago, that through studies of tree rings, sediment, and other natural evidence, researchers have documented multiple droughts in California that lasted ten or twenty years in a row during the past one thousand years compared to a mere three year duration of the current dry spell.</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>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 about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p> <p>In addition to San Luis Reservoir, SWP water is stored at Quail Lake, Pyramid Lake, Castaic Lake, Castaic Lagoon, Lake Silverwood, Lake Perris. Some water agencies have their own storage facilities, such as</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Metropolitan Water District's Diamond Valley Lake, Lake Mathews, and Lake Skinner.
430	1	<p>I live in Fairfield, California. I am the president of the Solano Rod and Gun Club, a group of 40 fishermen and hunters. And it has been in existence since 1980.</p> <p>I would like to make some comments about what I have seen happen to the Sacramento Delta. I came here in 1969. I' am an avid hunter and fisherman. In 1976 there was the most salmon, the most striped bass, no endangered smelt, and everything was in balance.</p> <p>Since 2001, since the increased amount of pumping of the water out of the Clifton Forebay, I have seen a decrease in the water quality of the Sacramento Delta, affecting not only fish, but the bait fish, the birds, and all the wildlife that I have seen for the last 40 years.</p> <p>There has been many of our members not even wanting to utilize the Delta anymore or buy fishing and hunting licenses because they feel that there is not enough reason for them to even pursue that.</p>	<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>The Proposed Project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the Proposed Project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p>
430	2	<p>My feelings on this proposed plan, I like the conservation part of it. I think that flooding the areas for more wildlife habitat and to increase the Delta for habitat increasing is a valuable tool; but I'm afraid that by taking more water out of the Sacramento River above the Delta there won't be the normal flushing action that has occurred for thousands of years that has created the Delta's wildlife and species. And so that part of the plan, I think, will make the Delta even worse for not only me, but for all the generations to come.</p>	<p>The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California Water Fix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state ESAs, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Chapter 6 (Surface Water) of the Draft EIR/EIS and Section 4 and Appendix A (Chapter 6) of the RDEIR/SDEIS for further information on flows and flushing action. The project 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>
431	1	<p>I am from Vacaville, California. The first comment that I have is that we spent ten years doing the Suisun Marsh Plan that got the approval from all of the regulatory agencies that chop off the BDCP.</p> <p>The suggestion is that the BDCP adopt all of the provisions and become consistent with the Suisun Marsh Plan.</p>	<p>As described in Chapter 1, Section 1.5, Relationship to Other Plans in the Delta, BDCP, the planning process for the proposed project included extensive coordination and collaboration with representatives of a number of overlapping plans, including the Suisun Marsh Habitat Management, Preservation, and Restoration Plan (SMP). The purpose of this coordination was to ensure that the proposed project's conservation strategy complements the conservation strategy of these other plans and to ensure that implementation does not preclude the successful implementation of these plans. The proposed project's conservation strategy was designed to account for this overlap and to ensure that approved plans can complete implementation.</p> <p>Further, the BDCP Implementation Office intends to manage future implementation actions in close coordination with programs such as the SMP to ensure the best outcomes for these existing programs. .</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
432	1	My major concerns with this are probably environmental in origin. I understand that we have to balance the limited resources, water resources we have, but I am very concerned about the environmental and the salmon and fisheries that do not have the luxury of, if they go extinct they cannot be simply replanted like some agricultural issues. So my main concern would be how strong the environmental safeguards and guarantees would be in this project.	<p>The proposed project is intended to facilitate the recovery of salmon and other fisheries species. A Collaborative Science and Adaptive Management Program will be used to evaluate and consider changes in the operational criteria based on information gained before and after the new facilities become operational. This program will be used to consider and address scientific uncertainty regarding the Delta ecosystem and to inform implementation of the operational criteria in the near term for existing BiOps for the coordinated operations of the CVP/SWP (USFWS 2008, NMFS 2009) and the 2081b permit for the SWP facilities and operations (CDFG 2009), as well as in the future for the new BiOp and 2081(b) for this proposed action.</p> <p>Suspension or revocation of the "take" permits, or portions of permits is possible if the project is not being properly implemented. Proper implementation means that the adaptive management program is being followed as the project intends. If mitigation measures are not being implemented as the plan requires, and corrections are not being made to ensure proper implementation, the permitting agencies may have grounds to suspend or revoke the take permits.</p> <p>In addition, the permitting agencies have the ability to suspend or revoke the permits for a particular covered species where continuation of a permitted activity would jeopardize the continued existence of that species and the impact of the permitted activity on the species has not been remedied in a timely manner.</p>
432	2	I know political persuasions change all the time. I would be concerned about long-term political shifts that would be more supportive of agribusiness rather than environmental.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
432	3	<p>I remember very well in 2002 Klamath River had a similar water diversion that resulted in a catastrophic loss of salmon fishery up there, hundreds of thousands of fish were dead after the federal government guaranteed there would be no impact from water diversions. Then the investigation resulting from that die-off stated that the death of a salmon was actually due to diseases, not directly to the water, which everybody knew was the wrong conclusion.</p> <p>I am a little concerned that there is built-in extra water pumping capacity as a political ally shift, but that would not be taken advantage of. So environmental concerns and guarantees.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the Proposed Project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount 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>Discussion of the main environmental attributes affecting individual covered species is 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 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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Biological Resources, and Appendix 3B Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs of the RDEIR/SDEIS.
432	4	<p>I guess the second concern would be costs associated and how they are paid back long-term by water users. I guess water managers or people who are going to invest in this water infrastructure will obviously want to be paid back, it would be like an investment. What kind of guarantees are there around the state water users in their long-term cost to pay this investment back?</p> <p>To me it seems like it is kind of a wolf in sheep's clothing; you get this for free, but we could be stuck paying this back for decades and decades, and my kids' kids could potentially be paying this back in either environmental impact or cost, taxes or increased water rates.</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 funding of the proposed project please see Master Response 5.</p>
433	1	<p>The Congressman Boehner bill that he threatened to produce yesterday would, as I understand it, suspend environmental protections in the water system if there is any water that can be shipped south.</p> <p>Now, this is a most dramatic and misguided proposal, and it would result in such devastation of the fisheries that it seems to me, since they have promised to push this through in one form or another, that this plan should consider, as a formal alternative, what happens if a Congressman Boehner bill or some similar legislation gets passed. We need to know through an EIR or an EIS on that subject what would the consequences be.</p>	<p>It is unclear what bill to which the commenter is referring. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
433	2	<p>I think this entire project should be placed before the voters, period. If it is not, I think that you have an obligation to explain to the voters why they are excluded.</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> <p>Even so, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>For more information on public outreach efforts, please see Master Response 40.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
433	3	Number three, fracking. We should be informed of any possible use of the project water for fracking. There is a lack of information on the subject in the materials that I have seen. I think that the BDCP should provide the people with an assurance that this water shipped south will not be used for fracking.	<p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to stipulated beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows. Fracking – or “hydraulic fracturing” -- presumably could be an “industrial” use of water. As of the present, hydraulic fracturing is a lawful use of water, as state law generally permits oil and gas operators to engage in “the injection of air, gas, water, or other fluids into the productive strata, the application of pressure heat or other means for the reduction of viscosity of the hydrocarbons, the supplying of additional motive force, or the creating of enlarged or new channels for the underground movement of hydrocarbons into production wells[.]” (Cal. Pub. Resources Code, § 3106[b].)</p> <p>The state Department of Conservation is currently working on fracking regulations and rules passed by the Legislature have been sent to the governor. Through the rule-making process, the state will better understand how much water is actually used for fracking in California. Voluntary reporting indicates that the use of water for fracking is minimal. The Department of Conservation estimates that statewide, about 270 acre-feet of water per year is used for hydraulic fracture stimulation activities. For comparison’s sake, roughly 5.2 million acre-feet of water a year have been diverted from the Delta, on average, over the last 20 years by the federal and state water projects for farms and cities.</p> <p>The State Water Resources Control Board could modify water permits to balance and protect beneficial uses of water. If the Legislature declared fracking to be unreasonable, it would potentially trigger the State Water Resources Control Board to revise water right permits in such a way as to restrict Delta water from being used for fracking.</p>
433	4	I have seen a recent suggestion that a great part of this problem can be solved by buying out the westlands agricultural interests. I think that the volume of water recovered from the wasteful application in the western San Joaquin Valley would satisfy many of the demands that are being placed on our resources. I think that this should rise to the status of a formal alternative in the plan.	<p>The proposed project is just one element of the state’s long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>Although components such as desalination plants and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. It is important to note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California’s water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Please refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation. 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>
433	5	I think I join others in asking for an extension of this comment period for at least another sixty days.	The public comment period for the 2013 Public Draft BDCP and EIR/EIS was extended to July 29, 2014. Please see Master Response 39 for more information about the public review period.
434	1	My concern is if they divert so much water toward the Delta, like a few years ago they did not put any toward the Klamath River up north and we lost tens of thousands of salmon, not little fish, we are talking 30, 40, 50-pounders. And this year the water came late, they finally got there, so the fish basically locked themselves up -- because the water was too warm coming down, so they locked themselves up right at the mouth of the Klamath, they stayed right there within maybe a 500 yard section of the Klamath. Then once the water got	It is unclear whether the commenter is implying that the BDCP could affect flows in the Klamath River – if that is the implication, then there it is necessary to clarify that the Central Valley Project (CVP) is not connected to the Klamath River. The CVP is connected to the Trinity River, a tributary to the Klamath River, but as shown in Appendix 5.C of the public draft BDCP, there would be very little difference in flow and therefore habitat within the Trinity River for covered fishes. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		cold enough, then they started going upstream.	<p>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 and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A.</p>
434	2	They should allow people to vote on this thing instead of cram it through. There is a lot of people -- I talked to one gentleman here who said he went to the fish show up in Sacramento, and hardly anybody knew about this meeting or any of the meetings. So they need to put more word out, and they need to let people know what the heck is going on, because I do not think this is right.	<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> <p>Even so, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>For more information on public outreach efforts, please see Master Response 40.</p>
434	3	<p>They need to put desalination plants in Southern California. I understood from the one lady down here that they have one in Southern California, and that's the L.A. area, and they don't have anything in San Diego. So they're still relying on Northern California for their water.</p> <p>I read an article in here recently that we could be on the verge of a 180-year drought, and if that happens, there ain't going to be any water anywhere, so what are they going to do then? They need to start planning ahead instead of worrying about putting tunnels in, and start building plants.</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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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>
434	4	If there are fish screens on this new pump, why they cannot put the fish net screens on the old pumps to cover it.	<p>"DWR and Reclamation are required to improve fish collection efficiency at the existing south Delta salvage facilities, as part of facility improvements required by the National Marine Fisheries Service 2009 biological opinion on the SWP/CVP. For example, in 2014 Reclamation replaced the secondary louver system with a traveling screen system. These screens provide protection by guiding fish into the holding tanks while catching debris on pegs and transporting debris to a collection system at the work surface.</p> <p>The technology required at the proposed north Delta intakes and the existing south Delta export facilities differ fundamentally. The north Delta intakes would be located on the side of the river channel and so would be designed to comply with CDFW, NMFS, and USFWS fish screening criteria (BDCP Appendix 5B Section 3.B.3.3). The south Delta export facilities are located on dead-end channels and requires active collection and salvage of fishes.</p> <p>Screening the intakes at Clifton Court Forebay was analyzed during the water conveyance alternative development process and is described in the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS, Appendix 3A. This alternative was eliminated from further evaluation because initial results of recent studies, including information included in the recent NMFS biological opinions, supported a phased approach that would emphasize improvements to operations of fish handling facilities and reduced predator potential within Clifton Court Forebay prior to further analysis of installation of fish screens. Nevertheless, DWR and Reclamation will continue investigating strategies to increase fish salvage efficiency, reduce pre-screen losses, and improve screening efficiencies, consistent with the 2009 biological opinion of the SWP/CVP."</p> <p>Please also see Master Response 28 regarding operational criteria.</p>
435	1	<p>On the agricultural mitigations for the loss of the tens of thousands of acres that they intend to take out of the agricultural economy in Solano County, the mitigations are inadequate. They should calculate the economic impact with multipliers, and they should ensure that there are investments that will generate equivalent or better economic activity in the county, as well as mitigate all of the lost sales tax revenue, property tax revenues, and mosquito abatement district fees, and all the other things that would need to be done.</p> <p>But the impact has -- the mitigation has to be done in such a way that in perpetuity and an inflation adjusted mechanism that there is no net loss in economic activity from the discretionary act of taking the agricultural land out of production.</p>	<p>Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, EIR/EIS, identifies several mitigation measures that are intended to avoid, reduce, and/or minimize the effects on agricultural resources in the Delta. Please see Master Response 18 regarding the adequacy of mitigation measures proposed for agricultural impacts identified in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>While CEQA does not require mitigation for purely economic effects, the mitigation approach includes an optional alternative to the conventional strategy for mitigating environmental effects on agricultural resources. This approach explores a voluntary framework that provides, at a minimum, a neutral agricultural economic effect on affected lands in the Delta as a result of the proposed project, taking into consideration the desire of individual Delta farmers to continue working on their land, the long-term viability of regional agricultural economies, the economic health of local governments and special districts, and the Delta as an</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>evolving place.</p> <p>Economic effects are primarily described in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, EIR/EIS. For each alternative, effects on agricultural economics are provided, which include estimates of direct, indirect, and induced effects (i.e., using multipliers). Impacts are reported in terms of changes in employment, labor income, and production value related to the agricultural sector.</p> <p>Effects on local government fiscal conditions (including changes in tax revenue) are described under Impacts ECON-4, ECON-10, and ECON-16. Notably, Water Code section 85089 provides that “[c]onstruction of a new Delta conveyance facility shall not be initiated” until the benefitting federal and state water contractors, or a joint powers authority representing them, have made arrangements or entered into contracts requiring them to pay for both (a) the “costs of the environmental review, planning, design, construction, and mitigation” required for such a facility and (b) “[f]ull mitigation of property tax or assessments levied by local governments or special districts for land use in the construction, location, mitigation, or operation of new Delta conveyance facilities.”</p> <p>In addition, the project proponents would prepare and implement mosquito management plans in consultation with Mosquito and Vector Control Districts in the Plan Area. See Appendix 3B, Section 3B.1.15, Prepare and Implement Mosquito Management Plans, EIR/EIS, for more information regarding this commitment.</p>
435	2	There is a priority of water rights that is in state law that has been litigated through the State Supreme Court and upheld multiple times that does not seem to be reflected in the plan when there is a supply shortage to provide reliability to people with inferior junior water rights. So how is this system going to be adjusted to reflect the priority of water rights for those in the area of origin with riparian water rights?	<p>The State Water Resources Control Board, not DWR, is responsible for decisions relating to water rights. DWR holds water rights approved by the State Water Resources Control Board but does not have the power or authority to issue water rights to others. Additionally, the proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor include any regulatory actions that would affect water rights holders other than DWR, Reclamation, and SWP and CVP contractors.</p> <p>Importantly, all water exported by the SWP and CVP is the subject of the existing water rights of those two agencies. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives analyzed in the EIR/EIS only include the use of water from existing SWP and CVP water rights or voluntary water transfers from other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders.</p> <p>For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.</p>
436	1	<p>I am here representing myself and my association, which is called the Kern County Minority Contractors Association. We support the fact that we need to have a statewide water district, so we support this project.</p> <p>But the only concern is that it be a balanced project between the environmental concerns, the growers that need water, and the public. So whatever we do is just try to make sure it's a win-win for all that's concerned, and it's a balanced project.</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:</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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>
436	2	<p>We need to get ahead of the project and get prepared for the future, because of the needs of the state in terms of water. And the fact is, if we do not improve the Delta -- because I am in disaster preparedness, I believe a major disaster of an earthquake is something that could contaminate that system. So we need to have this.</p> <p>I know a lot of people saying, "Well, it's not something we need to worry about," but then we have that where the beavers went in and breached the dam. So we need to prepare for our future.</p>	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
436	3	<p>My concern is that if this project is going to come through this valley, who is going to get the jobs? Who is going to get the contracts? And my concern is that I want to see diversity on these projects in terms of the work force and also the contracts.</p> <p>That is the same thing with high speed rail. The project comes through our neighborhood, we want to get the economic benefit from it. The fact that this project is probably going to go forward I believe you are going to get enough support to move it forward that early in the process we make sure that the people in the valley are going to benefit, not only getting the project through their neighborhood, but we get the first crack at the jobs and contracts. So it would be something to put together to make sure we benefit from that.</p>	<p>It is assumed that the majority (approximately 70 percent) of construction workers would be drawn from the five Delta counties. Approximately 30 percent of construction workers are expected to come from outside of the Delta region. For more information, please see Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, Impact ECON-2, 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS, and Chapter 30, Section 30.3.2.1, Direct Growth Inducement, 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS. Additionally, the Job Creation & Protection Fact Sheet reports that 155,090 jobs will be created by the 2013 proposed project (a full-time equivalent job is defined as one person working full-time for one year).</p>
436	4	<p>We're [Kern County Contractors Association] going to be putting together a transportation summit here in Bakersfield, March 26th through the 27th. I am asking that someone from the water agency come and be a part of the conference, to talk about what are the opportunities available on water projects that are going on through the state, as far as people that want to get jobs and contracts.</p> <p>The reason I say California transportation summit, which I am submitting a flyer into your record that's part of my comments, but you say what does water have to do with transportation? I look at the water -- Delta system as a part of transportation that's moving waterways. And we're having the California Secretary of Transportation, that's a newly appointed position by the governor, that's confirmed to be here. High speed rail will be here. Caltrans will be here, and we also invited the governor.</p> <p>The governor did visit our city day before yesterday, and he said he wanted to come back. So this morning I got ahold of his scheduler, and we invited him to come. So we would like to have someone from the water department, the state water resource as well, because I know that they have a lot of projects and they're under the state goal for small business, disadvantage business, and also veteran business.</p>	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
436	5	We're also concerned about the jobs, if we are going to be paying for this. I'm sure there's some kind of user fee or taxpayer that's going to pick up the cost sometime, and we're all going to be supporting it. So it's very important that everybody be involved in the economic benefit of it. So that's my concerns.	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 for the proposed project.
437	1	For fire restoration, I was on the upper watersheds as in where the decomposed granite fills up and first thing I would like to talk about is the extended effects of global warming, we are having almost a year-round growing season, and what is growing is brush. We are getting crown fires in the forest, rather than brush fires that clean it out. No shade. No snow. Mud going in, filling up the reservoirs, so we are having water loss. So is that going to be the new norm? Nobody is looking at that. Putting on Band-Aids on the Delta may not be appropriate.	<p>Effects of climate change on the action alternatives are assessed throughout the resource chapters in the Draft EIR/EIS. In each of these analyses, a projection of future climate that includes changes in temperature, precipitation, humidity, hydrology, and sea level rise are considered and evaluated. As identified in Table 29-1, additional analysis specific to fire risk can be found in Chapters 5, 11-18, 20, and 24 through 28.</p> <p>Chapter 29, Climate Change, assesses how the action alternatives affect the resiliency and adaptability of the Plan Area with respect to future climate shifts. The chapter specifically evaluates sea level rise, impacts to terrestrial habitat and species, delta levee stability, and changes to water demand and temperatures. Future climate predictions for the Plan Area, including fire risk, are also described in Section 29.5.1.3.</p> <p>Chapter 22, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, assesses the impact of construction and operation of the action alternatives on climate change. As discussed in Impacts AQ-21 and AQ-22 in the RDEIR/SDEIS, construction emissions will be offset to net zero through Mitigation Measure AQ-21, whereas operational emissions from SWP pumping will be reduced through modifications to DWR's Renewable Energy Procurement Program (REPP). Offsetting construction emissions ensures the project would not contribute to elevated GHG concentrations and associated climate change risks during construction. Likewise, reducing operational emissions consistent with DWR's Climate Action Plan ensures the project would not conflict with DWR's ability to achieve its 2050 GHG reduction goal.</p> <p>Finally, the project will contribute to more efficient use of California's water resources but is not intended to address all of California's water supply issues. The California Water Action Plan establishes a framework for addressing some of the upstream water supply reliability issues suggested by the commenter.</p>
437	2	<p>The water going into the reservoirs -- the Shasta, for example, has not been finished. World War II came along, and they took the cement and built runways for bombers. Should we finish it? They probably cannot, because the lake would go into wild and scenic river areas that preclude, would take forever to get that done. So if not, could fuse gates, they are a French bucket that goes on top of dams to raise the level of the dam a ways. Very cost effective. They have them here on the Kaweah River outside of Visalia, and they raised that water level. If that could be done, they are a towered balanced bucket. When the water -- and they are hollow, goes in over the top, they don't overtop, because they tip. They get water in them, and they tip. They are well-hated by all American engineers, because they were invented in France. Those people build big towers and stuff like that, nobody likes that. So anyway, that is a major thing.</p> <p>What is going on with Sites Reservoir, which probably is never going to happen? And it wouldn't affect the Delta that much anyway, or would it?</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that they required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>DWR, Reclamation, and local partners are evaluating the feasibility of additional storage to improve water supply and water supply reliability, increase survival of anadromous fish and other aquatic species, improve Delta water quality, and provide flexible energy generation benefits. Several new storage projects are in various stages of evaluation, including increasing the capacity of Shasta Reservoir and Los Vaqueros Reservoir, constructing Sites Reservoir in the Sacramento Valley, and constructing Temperance Flat Reservoir on the San Joaquin River. Efforts towards additional storage such as these could complement the proposed project, and are not alternatives to it.</p> <p>Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage. Please also see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS.</p>
437	3	On that Sacramento River, there are several duck refuges. I have been looking at duck refuges, because while they have the "Don't Move a Mussel" [signage] on the reservoirs, they do not have it at the duck refuges. People might -- and they go hunting in boats, and the hunters have waders and their dogs and their decoys, and all the other stuff can	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The preferred alternative, 4A, does not include any effects on Sacramento River duck refuges, or change the potential for mussel colonization.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>transport zebra mussels.</p> <p>The funding that might work on that would be from the Buchanan Bill that just passed, to get these things done. It is just an oversight. You know, it is done in other states, they just have not done it here.</p>	
437	4	<p>Coming down into the Delta, I am wondering, what is the formations that they are putting these tunnels into? And the rock, is it igneous or is it sedimentary, which is -- or will they be going through the fill of the Delta -- muck and I do not want to say muck which can be quite different building a tunnel, which they would have to concrete.</p> <p>I keep thinking of the Hayward fault seismic problems.</p>	<p>Figure 9-3 in Chapter 9 shows the surficial geologic units in which the tunnel shafts would be constructed. Figure 9-4 shows that clayey to sandy, unconsolidated to dense sedimentary deposits that would exist at, above, and under the planned tunnel depths. Organic soil materials (e.g., peat) would exist near the surface at some of the tunnel shaft locations and above some tunnel segments.</p> <p>Specific surficial geologic units that occur along the three tunnel conveyance alignments are described in Chapter 9, Tables 9-15, 9-19, and 9-23.</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 tunnels is not expected to increase the chance of an earthquake.</p>
437	5	<p>I had problems with the chain of lakes, which was the previous Bay Delta magic bullet, to cure all our problems. Which is the problem that we are having is magic bullets. For example, the cure at Red Bluff Diversion Dam, which was going to cure everything, and then the next thing is going to cure everything, and the next thing -- I have gotten quite cynical about these cures.</p> <p>I was wondering if the chain of lakes, maybe keep it on the surface. If -- if bayou might work.</p> <p>What I was looking at is the hundred thousand acres of mitigation that they want to do, and if the bayou can be project and self-mitigated -- or not. I don't know.</p>	<p>Please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A. Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The originally proposed habitat restoration measures and related Conservation Measures (CMs) (i.e., CM2 through CM21) would not be included as part of the Proposed Action, except to the extent required to mitigate significant environmental effects under CEQA and meet the regulatory standards of ESA Section 7 and California Endangered Species Act (CESA) Section 2081(b).</p>
437	6	<p>They are supposed to keep areas on the tax roll. Therefore, anything they do with state parks is out. State parks never pays taxes. Fish and game rarely does. So my thing is, the state giving it -- having that done using the Pittman-Robertson funding of the federal government, using federal duck stamps, and federal funding, and Dingell-Johnson. These are federal excise taxes that could be applied. Have it done by the Fish and Wildlife Service. The upside being, they pay in-lieu fees of taxes to the local counties. The downside is, around here they have been getting into being parks, concentrating on parks rather than wildlife.</p> <p>The state parks, of course, are going to be into parks people first, wildlife second. The object of the mitigation is wildlife first, people second. It is not that park people are evil, it is just that that is their mandate.</p>	<p>Property tax revenue effects of land acquisitions required for construction of water conveyance facilities are discussed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, Impact ECON-4, EIR/EIS. As discussed for this impact under each alternative, the project proponents would make arrangements to compensate local governments for the loss of property tax or assessment revenue for land used for constructing, locating, operating, or mitigating for new Delta water conveyance facilities. Notably, California Water Code section 85089 provides that "[c]onstruction of a new Delta conveyance facility shall not be initiated" until the benefitting federal and state water contractors, or a joint powers authority representing them, have made arrangements or entered into contracts requiring them to pay for both (a) the "costs of the environmental review, planning, design, construction, and mitigation" required for such a facility and (b) "[f]ull mitigation of property tax or assessments levied by local governments or special districts for land use in the construction, location, mitigation, or operation of new Delta conveyance facilities."</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Similarly, for land acquired for habitat restoration measures under the environmental commitments (see Impact ECON-16), project proponents would compensate local governments and special districts for forgone revenue.</p> <p>As a result, although land would be removed from the local tax base for project purposes, local governments and special districts would be compensated for lost property tax revenues.</p>
437	7	In Bakersfield, at the last drought, there was a great deal of whining and gnashing of teeth, that the state bought twice -- twice they paid for a water bank west of this town. This water bank seems to be operated like the American International Group bank. It has been looted. When it was given, the state bought it and de facto gave it to private party, 60 percent of it. They have formed a marketing committee to sell that water out of the basin. Not all that legal or ethical. It has no water in it, so it is not doing the locals any good.	As discussed in Section 7.1.13 of Chapter 7, Groundwater, of the EIR/EIS, the Kern Water Bank is owned and operated by the Kern Water Bank Authority which includes agencies located in Kern County. Water is stored in the groundwater bank during wetter years, and withdrawn during drier years.
437	8	The City of Bakersfield uses one-eighth of the water in this county on the project, pays seven-eighths of that project cost. The town of Lost Hills has no lawns in it, very good, because they can't afford it. They are paying for their same people -- they are paying Paramount's employer water bill.	Rates charged to water users by individual water agencies receiving SWP or CVP supplies are based on the independent rate-setting policies of those agencies. Implementation of the proposed project would not affect how agencies distribute water supply costs among their water customers.
437	9	The lack of water meters and other parks, they are supposed to -- is that the cost is falling disproportionately on underserved communities. Therefore, this may be an environmental justice killer. I have no idea. This takes being a lawyer. I am not a lawyer. My parents insisted all us boys take up honest work. They should take a look, is this going to be a killer on getting federal funding, as I was just discussing.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. For more information regarding cost and funding of the proposed project please see Master Response 5.
437	10	It is not doing any good to anybody here anyway, that perhaps the Kern Water Bank could also be used as mitigation. The state gave the -- to private -- to water bank authority, and in turn the water bank authority is now giving mitigation credits -- selling mitigation credits, not giving -- selling mitigation credits back to the state, who gave them the land to begin with, which is kind of a twofer. That is a big thing.	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.
437	11	With the land -- with anything, calculated that star thistle uses more water by evapotranspiration more than regular grass, than exists in Isabella reservoir, you know. Six, 700,000 acre feet statewide. Now, they should be looking at some of the others.	<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>The prevalence of non-native species in the Delta is described in BDCP Section 2.3.4, where each natural community description contains a subsection describing the prevalence and ecological consequences of non-native species in that natural community. The proposed project will incorporate existing Conservation</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Measures from the BDCP as Environmental Commitments (ECs) to further address the issue of non-native species (RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix 3B Section 3B.5). EC 11- Natural Communities Enhancement and Management- describes how non-native vegetation will be disturbed or removed. Restoration ECs may have non-native weed control through operation and maintenance of restored sites (EC 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10). EC 15, Localized Reduction of Predatory Fish, does not intend to entirely remove non-native predators at the north and south Delta export facilities. It is intended to reduce localized abundance of fish predators of salmonids at these two locations through active capture methods. Division of Boating and Waterways' Aquatic Weed Control Program helps suppress and control Water Hyacinth and Egeria densa.
437	12	The refuge I was talking about, the federal refuge -- the one that is in Kern County -- is square miles of Salt Cedar, or Tamarisk, which can use up to a couple hundred gallons [of water] per plant per day. And it is solid, like it is a crop. When they retire lands, will it be worth taking it over and we go into the deal? It has ungodly roots. A major -- appropriate horticulture might be in order to -- in a lot of areas.	<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>The same principles apply to federal refuges that receive water from the CVP. The Lead Agencies suggest that the commenter raise concerns about Salt Cedar, an invasive species, with the managers of the federal refuge at issue.</p>
437	13	I would love to see them get rid of Bermuda grass, which uses 36 inches of water a day, and go into something like poa which uses six, pine bluegrass. And there is a variety that was done, the state did not take it, that they could have had for that. It makes me sick too. It makes a lot of people sick. And I do not think that -- the fact this brings us into, the statewide amount of water used inappropriately for aesthetic purposes in people's yards and parks and stuff.	<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</p>

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> <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>
437	14	The amount of water that is lost by -- we do not do any no-till farming. This is the 75th year of The Grapes of Wrath. We are having celebrations here. It seems that maybe when people came here from Oklahoma, they also brought their dust storm technology with them. We seem to have a heavy problem with PM10, particulate matter of ten microns. Perhaps the no-till would be appropriate. Conservation ag seems to be appropriate in other places for the last 50 years. They are in the same situation, Eastern Washington and stuff.	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 or what types of agricultural practices are used. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via BDCP proposed conveyance facilities. Contractors and their customers must make economic decisions in light of the amounts of water they are likely to receive going forward.
437	15	A big problem, and major problem, is with the DWR, which, as you know, stands for delays while rewriting, having an in-house syndrome and not really looking at forum.	Please refer to Chapter 32 in the EIR/EIS and Master Response 40 regarding the adequacy of outreach conducted for California WaterFix and the BDCP.
437	16	China is even going pretty heavy into the upper watersheds to save water. I think we are going to have big shade -- you know, loss of water in the upper watersheds. So dealing with the Delta is dealing with the result, not a cause. I have got more, but that will do it for now.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
437	17	<p>Tertiary treat the water. Living -- getting the results of Sacramento's sewage in this area. They tertiary treat the water at the Bufferlands, or at Stone Lakes, or the refuge up there, just outside of it -- put in some tertiary treatment, like a marsh to treat the sewage water. The nutrients are swallowed up, and the nitrogen and caca and all that stuff gets turned into bulrushes and stuff.</p> <p>That is one that would really work. And that is -- the people will not like it, because they will have marsh next to their houses, but they can move it somewhere up there.</p> <p>That is why I was thinking about bayou.</p>	<p>The Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant (SRWTP), which discharges treated effluent into the Sacramento River south (downstream) of the City of Sacramento, is not an element of the proposed project. The Sacramento County Regional Sanitation District (SRCSD), which operates that facility, is implementing its EchoWater Project which will bring extensive improvements to the SRWTP treatment processes to meet more stringent permit requirements that were adopted by the Central Valley RWQCB. For more information about the EchoWater Project and its Final EIR please visit http://www.regionalsan.com/reports.</p> <p>A large fraction of ammonia in the Sacramento River will be removed due to planned upgrades to the Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District's Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant (SRWTP) which will result in >95% removal of ammonia from the effluent discharge from this facility. Following the SRWTP upgrades, levels of ammonia in Sacramento River are expected to be similar to background ammonia concentrations in the San Joaquin River and San Francisco Bay (See Section 8.3.3.1, Impact WQ-1) (RDEIR/SDEIS Chapter 8 Section 8.3.1.7 Constituent-Specific Considerations Used in the</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Assessment).
437	18	<p>I still think that they are not looking enough at the cultural aspects, rather than the technical aspects. With the amount of push water necessary to keep out salt water intrusion into the Delta, would it be beneficial -- this is funny, probably -- to have a brackish water desalinization plant in the Delta that would feed into the Tracy pumps, which everybody thinks is good.</p> <p>However, when I mentioned that in order to power it they ought to put in a nuclear plant, all the sudden all the environmental people come unglued.</p>	<p>The Lead Agencies are following the appropriate legal process and are complying with CEQA and NEPA, and all other applicable regulatory requirements, in preparing the EIR/EIS for the proposed project. For more information regarding cultural resources please see Chapter 18 of the EIR/EIS and Master Response 20.</p> <p>Please also refer to 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 such as desalination or other water supply solutions.</p>
437	19	What is the impact on the ag for the Delta vis-a-vis the agriculture -- are you losing agriculture loss in the Delta for agriculture in the San Joaquin?	Construction of new physical facilities (CM1) in the Delta and the restoration of habitat will lead to the conversion of some amounts of agricultural land in the Delta (as identified in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, of the EIR/EIS and potentially tens of thousands of acres to be converted as a result of habitat restoration associated with the BDCP (the actual amount of conversion won't be known until site-specific locations for these activities have been developed). These effects will be subject to aggressive mitigation efforts. Land that is not directly affected by construction or habitat restoration should remain productive. Effects on farmland in the Delta, along with associated mitigation measures, are described in Chapter 14. See Master Response 18 for more information regarding agricultural impact mitigation.
437	20	What is the cost-benefit ratios thereupon for the whole project? Cost benefit ratios? How much water currently is to keep out the salt water intrusion? What is going to happen with further arctic melting? Sea level rise? I have not seen anything on that.	<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 proposed project 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> <p>Regulatory water quality objectives (or guidance values) exist for salinity for protection of agricultural water supply, municipal and industrial drinking water supply, and fish and wildlife beneficial uses set by the SWRCB. 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 potential effects associated with the project and alternatives, modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present. For more information regarding project impacts to water quality please see Chapter 8 of the FEIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 19 for more information regarding climate change and GHG.</p>
437	21	You have not been looking at the watering of the San Joaquin up there in Fresno, because that is going to be water that impacts elsewhere, secondary impacts. Because you have taken water from one place to put it into there, it should be else and the possible negative impacts financially.	The Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and all of the alternatives in the EIR/EIS assume implementation of the San Joaquin River Restoration Project in the future, as described in Section 3D.3.1.3 of Appendix 3D, Defining Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and Cumulative Impact Conditions.
437	22	<p>I think that one is getting to be a boondoggle, at their buildings at Friant, which I would like to see -- Friant Dam, by the way, might be a candidate for fuse gates, the buckets. And I think the best place to put it -- the more storage would be at Fine Gold Creek, F-i-n-e, as in real -- it is in the sand, not as in seek and ye shall find gold. They are already-- Temperance Flat Dam is right on top of going -- the future.</p> <p>The state parks have decided that is not going to happen, because they want to put a campground there, so they can sell bumper stickers, save Temperance Flat.</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> <p>Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that they required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		The water that comes off Kerckhoff, way up there, should be running into Fine Gold Reservoir there, because they -- the Temperance Flat Dam will eliminate power plants. The only way you can get power plants, maybe -- maybe not. I do not even know if there is going to be enough water to fill anything, let alone even the fuse gates at any of the other reservoirs. That should be determined.	
437	23	Having water is one thing. Not having the power to pump it will make it moot, if -- you know, the farmer cannot afford to pump water out of a canal or ditch or whatever, or the ground, then he de facto does not have any water. He cannot afford the pumping costs. If the groundwater sinks too, it gets more to pump it from lower depths. So that is a major thing. That one really should be taken -- they should take a good hard look at it.	<p>The BDCP could require additional power in order to operate the proposed pumping plants. These power requirements are presented in Table 21-11 in Chapter 21, Energy, EIR/EIS. In general, the energy required for pumping correlates to the amount of water being diverted from the Delta. Thus, compared to Existing Conditions, some alternatives would require less energy (since they would involve lower levels of Delta exports). Power costs have been included in the cost estimate for the water conveyance facilities (see Table 8-5 in Chapter 8, Implementation Costs and Funding Sources, BDCP). The estimated average annual cost for power during operations is \$6.25 million, which is included in the total estimated cost of Plan implementation.</p> <p>Regarding costs to individual farmers for pumping groundwater, the BDCP does not propose any changes to groundwater management. A reduction in deliveries to Export Service Areas could result in increased groundwater pumping, as described in Section 30.3.4.1 of Chapter 30, Growth Inducement and Other Indirect Effects, of the EIR/EIS. However, there are many factors that would influence the response of agricultural water agencies and individual farmers to reductions in deliveries from the Delta, including the availability of other surface supplies.</p>
437	24	It is uninhabitable putting water into a stream that has no shade. It is a nonviable stream. How are you going to get salmon up? When you catch them, they will be already poached from the temperature, and just -- may not be all that feasible. The last thing they should be adding is fish. Habitat should be restored first. Fish habitat is what I am getting at.	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p> <p>For more information regarding alternatives to the proposed project please see Master Response 4.</p>
437	25	There are a couple other places along that order too. Kern County is -- has a subsidy system called Zone of Benefit in which urban Bakersfield subsidizes agriculture water through a tax system called Zone of Benefit. I see this problem with environmental justice obtaining, federal benefits and assistance and perhaps state assistance. The state should look at this and see what -- and since the proportioned amount - the disproportioned amount of the cost of the project proposed chunnels, it is being paid for by Kern County. It will be paid for by the citizens of - or noncitizens, who live in Bakersfield. If for any reason they - this is the latest magic bullet - or not - that the tunnels do not work or are shut down for any reason, or fail, then we still have to pay the cost. Bust there is no benefit.	<p>Rates charged to water users by individual water agencies receiving SWP or CVP supplies are based on the independent rate-setting policies of those agencies. Implementation of the proposed project would not affect how agencies distribute water supply costs among their water customers.</p> <p>The project is designed to increase water supply reliability in the SWP/CVP export service area. Failure of the project's water conveyance system is speculative. However, should the project's water system fail temporarily, water contractors would still need to fund their ongoing project repayment obligations.</p>
438	1	I have a plan that will save us billions of dollars in water conservation. Herlong Army Depo, California, has seawater processing plants. Also the navy has on their aircraft carriers and all their ships. And all the commercial liners have water processing plants.	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. 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 such as 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>
438	2	<p>I have a plan which would get the water out of the sea to where we need it, including cutting the water off we are sending down south right now and filling it up with water from the sea through the Delta. We can make a lake out of Southern California. How does that sound?</p> <p>I have got to get his attention yet. Three times I called his office. No response. But my</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that they required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		congressman loves it.	
439	1	<p>I wanted to thank BDCP for putting together a very informative packet of materials on the Web site and here.</p> <p>What is disappointing is that I noticed that the comments are no longer being posted on the web site. They used to be on the web site, but they are no longer on there, so I feel like that prevents an intelligent dialogue. Under the regulations, from what I've read, the public policy behind this process is to allow a dialogue so that the public can intelligently weigh all the different alternatives.</p> <p>I feel like as a citizen of California who's affected by the Delta, because I live on the Delta, the tunnels and the impact of the tunnels to my community and to the environment and the water, I cannot reasonably get all the information. [Sic]</p>	<p>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>
439	2	The biological assessment has not been prepared, and I feel like it is premature to put forth this BDCP public draft without having a complete biological assessment.	<p>The Proposed Project has been developed with the goals of minimizing and avoiding incidental take of listed species to the maximum extent practicable. Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 12, Terrestrial Biological Resources, EIR/EIS, describe effects of the Proposed Project and several alternatives on fish and wildlife species in the Plan Area.</p> <p>Section 7 requires that federal agencies, in consultation with the federal fish and wildlife agencies, ensure that their actions are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of species or result in modification or destruction of critical habitat.</p> <p>Where the alternative does not include preparation of an HCP, ESA compliance for construction and operation of water intakes in the north Delta and associated conveyance facilities would be achieved solely through Section 7. For these alternatives, USFWS and NMFS would not issue a permit and would not act as a lead agency for NEPA compliance. Where Section 7 is the ESA compliance strategy, USFWS and NMFS will assume roles as cooperating agencies for purposes of the NEPA review.</p> <p>Reclamation would be the lead federal action agency for Section 7 compliance where a non-HCP alternative is selected. Reclamation's Section 7 compliance would be expected to also address the Section 7 compliance needs for the USACE permit actions. In cooperation with DWR, Reclamation would prepare a biological assessment (BA) for submission to USFWS and NMFS requesting formal consultation under ESA Section 7.</p> <p>A biological opinion is not required prior to the release of the Draft BDCP/CWF EIR/EIS. For the Proposed Action, the USFWS and NMFS will conduct an internal ESA section 7 consultation prior to issuance of an Section 10(a)(1)(B) permit for the Proposed Action. These federal agencies will coordinate the ESA consultation process and other environmental review processes, such as the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), consistent with federal regulations. In addition, the USFWS and NMFS will consult with the United States Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) to complete biological opinions or a joint biological opinion prior to federal action to carry out the BDCP.</p> <p>For more information please see 1.1.5.2 of Section 1 Introduction of the RDEIR/SDEIS.</p>
439	3	This public open house would have been more productive if it was a more public forum where there was a question/answer period rather than just a recording of my comment. So I feel like in that way it's not a very productive way of having the public participate, and that violates the public policy mandates of CEQA, NEPA, and the Endangered Species Act.	Please refer to Chapter 32 in the EIR/EIS and Master Responses 40 and 65 for information related to outreach, transparency of the planning process and stakeholder engagement.
440	1	I totally disapprove of the twin tunnel project. One reason is that Governor Brown has declared a drought year this year, but if it gets worse it will be a disaster year, and I am a	he 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

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>farmer. What will happen is we will have a certain amount of water and then be assured to plant crops, and in a disaster year they can take more water away from us and send it down -- send it down south.</p>	<p>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 about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p> <p>For more information regarding water supply please see Master Response 26 and Master Response 35.</p>
440	2	<p>Instead of a project like the tunnels, the money should be used for Sites Reservoir where we can get a million and a half acre-feet in a wet year and in a dry year like this it would help us all out completely.</p>	<p>For more information regarding water storage please see Master Response 37.</p>
440	3	<p>Use some of that money to desalinate the ocean. That's the final answer for where we are eventually going to get our water.</p> <p>And put a carrot out there for private industry like Bechtel Corporation, Fluor Corporation, that if you get an additional million and a half acre-feet per year of additional water at \$500 an acre-foot cost, then we will give you a bonus of five billion, not million but billion dollars.</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>
440	4	<p>With the tunnels, you are still going to have to send water through the Delta. So what is the purpose of having two different diversions? You are going to have the twin tunnels that will go down to where it goes into the canals and you'll still have the water for fish and wildlife going down through the Delta, so you are not going to gain a thing there.</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 water management practices across California, with or without the proposed project. The State is developing 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. The now preferred California Waterfix Project would help to address the resilience and adaptability of the Delta to climate change through water delivery facilities combined with a range of operational scenarios, measures focused on the protection, restoration, 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 water management flexibility created by new water diversions and operational scenarios, the project would improve habitat, increase food supplies and reduce the effects of other stressors on the Delta ecosystem. By improving and expanding available habitat, the proposed project would increase resilience and adaptability to climate change by making alternative habitat available during periods of high stress, such as very high or low freshwater inflow or very high salinity intrusion.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
440	5	<p>The private contractors, Metropolitan Water District, Kern County Water Agency, Westlands Water District, they are not going to sign contracts to take a share of the water from the twin tunnels unless they are guaranteed a certain amount of water each year. Plus, in a dry year they know they will be cut down some.</p> <p>But we realize -- we farmers north of Sacramento realize the only place for that water to come from for the tunnels is from us. We have these water rights that are senior water rights. We will do our share, but we are not going to go overboard.</p>	<p>The State Water Resources Control Board, not DWR, is responsible for decisions relating to water rights. DWR holds water rights approved by the State Water Resources Control Board but does not have the power or authority to issue water rights to others. Additionally, the proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor include any regulatory actions that would affect water rights holders other than DWR, Reclamation, and SWP and CVP contractors.</p> <p>Importantly, all water exported by the SWP and CVP is the subject of the existing water rights of those two agencies. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives analyzed in the EIR/EIS only include the use of water from existing SWP and CVP water rights or voluntary water transfers from other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders.</p> <p>For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.</p>
441	1	<p>My concern is that this is a very grandiose project that is going to cost a lot of money and disrupt a lot of our land. I feel that the water issue is a bigger issue than simply moving water from one part of the state to another. We are going to have to consider conservation, desalinization, ways to serve and keep water safe for the farms. I hate to see us going one direction to just build and move water without knowing that we are involved in an overall -- an overview that includes conservation as well as building to move the water. (sic)</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>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. 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>
442	1	<p>I am the chair of the Placer County Democratic Party. Our party passed a resolution to take a position against the Bay Delta Conservation Plan, especially the construction of twin tunnels.</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
442	2	<p>More diversion of water from Sacramento River will eventually dry up with all the climatic changes. We feel the Sacramento River will become partly or fully dried up like the San Joaquin River because a lot of water diversion is happening over 50, 60 years at the San Joaquin River.</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>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<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, restoration, 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, increase food supplies and reduce the effects of other stressors on the Delta ecosystem. By improving and expanding available habitat, the proposed project would increase resilience and adaptability to climate change by making alternative habitat available during periods of high stress, such as very high or low freshwater inflow or very high salinity intrusion.</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 adaptability of the Delta to climate change can be found in Chapter 29, Climate Change, EIR/EIS and Appendix A RDEIR/SDEIS and Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS (in appendix A).</p>
442	3	We fear that a lot of farmland in the Delta will be impacted when they start constructing the tunnels. The tunnels are huge. A lot of mud mixed with chemicals are going to be carried from the ground and spread all over, and the farmlands are going to be rendered not usable.	<p>Table 14-8 in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, EIR/EIS, identifies the agricultural conversion expected to take place as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities. Under the proposed BDCP (Alternative 4), approximately 6,300 acres of Important Farmland would be affected by construction of water conveyance facilities (either permanently or temporarily), approximately 1.23% of the Important Farmland in the BDCP study area (largely comprised of the Delta, Suisun Marsh, and Yolo Bypass). Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, EIR/EIS, identifies several mitigation measures that are intended to avoid, reduce, and/or minimize the effects on agricultural resources in the Delta. Please see Master Response 18 for additional information regarding agricultural impacts and mitigation as proposed in the BDCP and EIR/EIS. 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 and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 12 regarding reusable tunnel material, as well as the reusable tunnel material testing report, available on the project website. To reduce the long-term effects on land use and potentially support implementation of other project elements, DWR will develop site-specific plans for the beneficial reuse of this material, to the greatest extent feasible. See Appendix 3B, Section 3B.1.19, Disposal and Reuse of Spoils, Reusable Tunnel Material (RTM), and Dredged Material, EIR/EIS, for further discussion of this</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			commitment.
442	4	<p>As we get more water from the Sacramento River, less water is flowing into the ocean. That will make more seawater come back into the river, making the Delta a salty region, not friendly for the farmers or for the fish.</p> <p>So that is why we are taking an opposition position on the twin tunnels.</p>	<p>Note that the effects of less Sacramento River water flowing through the Delta on salinity-related parameters under certain project alternatives is fully addressed in Chapter 8, Water Quality. The water quality assessment addresses effects of changes in salinity on agricultural and fish and wildlife resources due to the project alternatives via the EC assessment (Impact WQ-11) through evaluation of compliance with agricultural and fish and wildlife objectives in the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan and degradation relative to existing conditions and the No Action Alternative. 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.</p>
443	1	<p>The BDCP planning decisions must, as required under the Delta Reform Act, be informed by the State Water Board's flow criteria, including criteria for inflows and outflows. The State Water Board is currently in the process of creating such flow criteria under the Bay Delta Water Quality Control Plan. As part of this process, an August 2010 flow criteria report from the State Water Board evaluated the specific Delta flow criteria that are necessary to provide adequate fishery protection.</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 EIR/EIS. Alternative 4 remains a potentially viable alternative and is being carried forward in the 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> <p>As described in Section 6.3.4 of Chapter 6, Surface Water, of the Final EIR/EIS, the State Water Resources Control Board is conducting a current program to update the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan. Since this program is still under development and the potential outcomes are not known at this time, this program is not included in the analysis.</p> <p>See also Master Response 31 regarding compliance with the Delta Reform Act.</p>
443	2	<p>The State Flow Criteria report calls for the following: 75 percent unimpaired Delta outflow from January through June, 75 percent unimpaired Sacramento River inflow from November through June, and 60 percent unimpaired San Joaquin River inflow from February through June.</p> <p>The Draft Substitute Environmental Document Bay Delta Water Quality Control Plan that followed, however, proposed far weaker flow criteria that failed to protect the most sensitive beneficial use. Instead, the criteria attempted to balance ecosystem and species needs with other uses, including agriculture, an approach that runs counter to the Clean Water Act. To comply with federal law and meet U.S. EPA approval, the State Water Board must ultimately adopt flow criteria similar to the August 2010 flow criteria report.</p>	<p>The EIR/EIS cannot project the results of the ongoing program being completed by the State Water Resources Control Board to update the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan.</p>
443	3	<p>Consistent with the Delta Reform Act and Clean Water Act, lead agencies must wait for the State Water Board to establish flow criteria that meet the standards of the Clean Water Act and the public trust doctrine before proceeding with the Bay Delta Conservation Plan, as the Bay Delta Conservation Plan must be informed by these criteria and the State Water Board must implement them.</p> <p>If the lead agencies insist on moving forward now, the BDCP must incorporate the science-based flow criteria based on the August 2010 State Water Board report, which better protects the most sensitive beneficial uses as per the Clean Water Act. While the Enhanced Spring Delta Outflow alternative, Alternative 8, is a step in the right direction, its</p>	<p>As described in Section 3A.9.4.2 of Final EIR/EIS Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives Conservation Measure 1, a potential alternative based upon the State Water Resources Control Board 2010 Development of Flow Criteria for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Ecosystem was considered during development of the range of alternatives to be evaluated in detail in the EIR/EIS. This potential alternative was not evaluated in detail because the flow recommendations in the 2010 report could not be achieved without adverse impacts to cold water management for fisheries in the Sacramento, Feather, and American rivers, and without reductions in non-SWP and non-CVP water rights diversions. The purpose and need of this EIR/EIS would not allow changes to these water rights users.</p> <p>In addition, the 2010 report stated that "Any process with regulatory or adjudicative effects must take place</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		modest waterway flow protection regime still falls well short of the Clean Water Act.	through the State Water Board's water quality control planning, water rights processes, or public trust proceedings in conformance with applicable law. In the State Water Board's development of Delta flow objectives with regulatory effect, it must ensure the reasonable protection of beneficial uses, which may entail balancing of competing beneficial uses of water, including municipal and industrial uses, agricultural uses, and other environmental uses."
443	4	Efforts to preemptively push through the current BDCP preferred alternative, which will likely increase exports rather than protect the Delta ecosystem, are contrary to law and will only accelerate the downward slide of Delta health. As articulated by the Environmental Water Caucus, the BDCP should add and analyze a no-tunnel alternative that addresses flow reversals by significantly reducing Delta exports and replacing them with water sources that encourage local water self-sufficiency and enhance the well-being of Delta species and ecosystems through flow restoration. A no-tunnel alternative with significantly reduced exports is not even considered in the draft EIR/EIS.	<p>Fifteen alternatives and 3 additional subalternatives were analyzed in the Draft EIR/EIS and the RDEIR/RSEIS respectively. Four major alignments have been included in the Final EIR/EIS: 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 Final EIR/EIS 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 that can be diverted 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 project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the proposed project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e., 2025 conditions without the proposed project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for Alternative 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS Section 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>
443	5	The State Water Board commented on the draft BDCP and EIR/EIS that in order for it to consider changes to the Bay Delta Plan and water rights, the BDCP must evaluate a sufficiently broad range of alternatives, including reduced reliance on exports. The current plan fails to do this and must address this gap.	The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Final EIR/EIS Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project.
443	6	<p>The BDCP provides a critical, timely opportunity for the state to at last establish comprehensive instream flow protections for the Delta based on Clean Water Act water quality standards and the inherent rights of waterways and fish populations to exist, thrive, and evolve. At the same time, it could also set the state on a path to resilient, locally self-sufficient water supply strategies. Instead, it merely serves to expand environmental harm and increase risky reliance on water sources that may shift dramatically under climate change and other future scenarios.</p> <p>I urge the BDCP lead agencies to revise and recirculate for public review the draft BDCP and draft BDCP EIR/EIS to reflect these recommendations and concerns.</p>	<p>The preferred alternative, Alternative 4A, no longer includes an HCP. The project would not affect upstream water rights or Table A amounts; instead, it is designed to be a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. Future water deliveries from the federal and state water projects are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years with project implementation. Refer to Master Response 26 for possible effects to northern California.</p> <p>By establishing an alternative diversion point for exports, a great deal of water management flexibility is added. This flexibility would provide more options for adaptively managing the Delta so that conditions can be optimized to provide the greatest benefits across all Delta water uses and habitat conditions. 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 action alternatives would be able to completely counteract all of the impacts of climate change.</p> <p>More information on ways in which the project proposes to improve resiliency and adaptability of the Delta to climate change can be found in Chapter 29, Climate Change, Final EIR/EIS and Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, Final EIR/EIS and for the new sub-alternatives in Section 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Additionally, refer to Master Response 19 (Climate Change and GHG).</p>
444	1	<p>I live here in Sacramento, and I use the Delta. I like to go kayaking in it and also bird watching. And, of course, I am very concerned about the health of the Delta. That is first and foremost to me what matters.</p> <p>So I favor Alternative 9 after studying all the different alternatives, including Alternative 4. The reason why I favor Alternative 9 is because there is a way of having the fish bypass the pumps that kill the fish. I was very impressed at how the maps showed there is a new route for the fish to come from the San Joaquin River and go through the Delta without getting sucked into the pumps. So that is a big plus for Alternative 9.</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 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>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
444	2	I like Alternative 9 because there is a much simpler and cheaper routing of water down from the Sacramento River into the pumps without having to build the tunnels. The tunnels trouble me because I just don't trust that there will be a limit on the water that is exported from the Delta to the two Southern California projects, the state and the federal project. I just worry that those exports will increase over time and that will be to the detriment of the health of the Delta.	Please see Master Response 30 regarding operational criteria. Under the stringent environmental statutes in place today, including the Endangered Species Act, operation of the proposed water delivery system could not drain the Delta rivers and channels dry, including the Sacramento River. The proposed project's facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants, would be operated in accordance with permits issued by, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the State Water Resources Control Board, among other agencies. The proposed project would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards.
444	3	The main reason why I am here today and what I like the most about the project is all the habitat conservation work, particularly the restoration of tidal marshlands, which will occur by flooding some of the islands and planting marsh grass on them. That will have enormous benefits for fish, for recreation, ecological health generally.	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

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		I would like to say lastly that no matter what happens with the tunnels or the other conveyances, I hope the state and federal government can go forward with the wildlife habitat element of this plan and restore 65,000 acres of tidal marshland and other benefits.	<p>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 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>
445	1	<p>In regards to the plan, I thought it was very informative. It gave me a broader understanding of what the entire plan was all about.</p> <p>My main concern was about the costs involved and the end users, which is I understand Southern California. My feeling is that the majority user, who is agriculture, would be paying a higher fee for the cost involved since they are using, according to one of the economists, 70 percent of the water. The fact that we as public citizens are subsidizing their use of the water I feel to be unfair.</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 Master Response 5 for more information on funding.</p>
446	1	<p>I am concerned about the water issue. Great news for the California Canal with shipping locks in it. The Pacific Ocean may be upset about this solution, but all of California will enjoy our unsalted fresh water.</p> <p>This is because 40 percent of all the fresh water California has is used to push the ocean out of the Delta. By putting a barrier up there with ship locks in it, we would be able to reduce the amount of water, perhaps five percent instead of 40 percent.</p> <p>We're in a drought situation, and this is absolutely imperative.</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:</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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 5 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage.</p>
446	2	<p>I love California, and I will tell you one thing. I would love to drink unsalted fresh water.</p> <p>I used to live in Pinole down there. Sometimes you go to the tap, and by golly, if you had some salt water inside of it. I am going, what is wrong with America and California if we have to let 40 percent of our fresh water go out and somebody like the governor tells us that what we have to do is conserve water a little bit.</p> <p>Well, most people are already conserving water, but what about the state of California conserving it, 40 percent of fresh water. How about reducing that so that we don't have to waste so much water? Maybe we could use it more for taking a little bit longer shower or something.</p> <p>It takes more water -- pushing more fresh water pushing the ocean out of the Delta than there is in Lake Tahoe. In one year, Lake Tahoe would be totally dry, and we would still need more fresh water to push the ocean out. So we need to think about that a little bit.</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>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>For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.</p>
447	1	<p>I want to make a comment about BDCP5, which is the effects analysis, specifically how it deals with listed fish species.</p> <p>The BDCP acknowledges or identifies low flows and high temperatures in Sacramento as stressors to endangered fish species.</p> <p>And Conservation Measure 2 under BDCP plans to flood the Yolo Bypass, diverting water from the Sacramento River to use as a flood plane and fish habitat.</p>	<p>As noted in Appendix 5.C (section 5C.4.4.4) of the 2013 Public Draft, water temperatures in the Plan Area are a function of climate as opposed to SWP/CVP operations. The potential effects of changes in river flow (e.g., on juvenile salmon survival) because of the Yolo Bypass and other factors (e.g., north Delta intakes) are examined in the Effects Analysis (see Chapter 5.5 and Appendix 5.C in particular). Greater inundation of the Yolo Bypass provides more access to floodplain habitat with relatively good survival and growth prospects. The effects analysis assesses potential outcomes of more access to the Yolo Bypass and less flow in the Sacramento River. Use of the Yolo Bypass route through the Delta will reduce the risk of entering the relatively low-survival interior Delta through Georgiana Slough or the Delta Cross Channel and of passing by the new north Delta intakes, and increase the diversity of migration pathways, which provides a safeguard</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>But if there is already low flow in the Sacramento, high temperatures, diverting more water out of Sacramento is only going to make those problems worse.</p> <p>It does not matter if fish are in the Sacramento River or in the Yolo Bypass. If there are lower flows and higher temperatures, it is going to worsen the stressors.</p>	<p>against unpredictable stochastic events occurring along any single migration pathway. Please see Master Response 5 for additional detail on the BDCP and the alternatives involving an HCP component. 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>
448	1	<p>My main concern is, looking around this room today, I see most of the focus is on habitat, and how we are going to take care of the fish. I do not see a lot of flexibility.</p> <p>I am taking care of the agricultural interest. I am concerned already. I realize the Delta needs to be flushed. It needs to have a certain amount of flow through it.</p> <p>I just question whether the water that comes down the Sacramento River especially is being used wisely. I have noticed over the last three summers that the water level in the Sacramento River as it flows through Knight's Landing area is probably at least two feet higher than it has been historically in the summer, and that has increased flows, I am assuming, to help the fish swim in the Delta or to send more water south.</p> <p>Consequently, in a year like this, Shasta Dam has been seriously depleted because of these extra summer flows. Two massive tunnels are built. That is going to guarantee more water is exported down south. The fish and the wildlife people, they are always going to be screaming to take care of their constituents.</p> <p>So where does that leave agriculture. We could conceivably end up with less water in the north even though we are the source of 98 percent of the water in the state.</p> <p>So I just disagree strenuously with this extreme focus on habitat wildlife; it does not seem to be a lot of common sense and flexibility on how we're using a lot of this water. I would like to put an opposition to restoring the San Joaquin Watershed.</p> <p>I disapprove of favoring, of trying to re-establish a salmon run as opposed to using that water for agricultural purposes. I do not really believe it is ever going to have a very viable salmon run again.</p> <p>I am frustrated with the whole process. I just want my interest to come first before the fish and the habitat restoration. The Delta's never going to be like it was.</p> <p>I think a lot of this environmentalism is romanticizing the passion, and I do not really want to go back and live like 150 years ago. I do not know why people have this idea that it was that much better than it is today.</p>	<p>BDCP needs to address both habitat and water supply issues in order to comply with the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Reform Act, which made it state policy to manage the Delta in support of the coequal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration. Accordingly, the BDCP is designed as a Habitat Conservation Plan and Natural Community Conservation Plan, which are regulated by federal and state laws and meant to conserve threatened and endangered species. Made up of 22 individual conservation measures, the BDCP seeks to implement habitat restoration actions to protect and promote recovery for all 56 species it covers.</p> <p>The BDCP also proposes to secure California water supplies and improve the Delta ecosystem by implementing a 9,000 cfs water diversion point in the north Delta, where its operations will provide for improved flows. Constructing new water diversion points in the north Delta with state-of-the-art fish screens and providing a means to transport water supplies under the Delta, rather than through sensitive natural channels, would provide flexibility in managing the SWP and CVP, and would help maintain reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California's population while balancing the needs of the Delta ecosystem.</p> <p>Regarding the Sacramento River water levels, flows in the summer months of drier years (such as 2012-2014) are primarily related to water released for water rights, refuges (in the early fall), temperature criteria, and Delta salinity requirements. For example, American River flows were increased in June 2014 to maintain Delta salinity. According to a review of mean daily flows from the CDEC database, flows in 2014 are lower than normal, and flows in 2012 and 2013 were within historical values except during wet periods when the river flows were related to runoff (rather than reservoir releases).</p> <p>Regarding habitat restoration, while there is uncertainty regarding the level of success of habitat restoration, BDCP proponents believe that habitat restoration in the San Joaquin River and throughout the Plan Area will provide benefits to covered fish species, including but not limited to salmonids, and the rest of the ecosystem.</p>
449	1	<p>Our district includes Sacramento, Elk Grove, Galt and Lodi, which are areas and communities that rely heavily on a healthy and thriving Delta.</p> <p>Dr. Pan has had many conversations with concerned constituents in our district that have expressed their opposition and issues with the tunnel project. Thousands of working men and women depend on the competitive advantage that our local agriculture provides for our economy.</p> <p>We recognize that if the state moved forward with the tunnel project, we'd be endangering the livelihood of community in the Delta that rely on the Delta and the fish that it produced in a delicately balanced ecosystem that makes up the largest estuary on the west coast.</p>	<p>The Lead Agencies acknowledge your opposition to the BDCP.</p> <p>Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, EIR/EIS, identifies several mitigation measures that are intended to avoid, reduce, and/or minimize the effects on agricultural resources in the Delta. While the chapter does acknowledge a number of effects on farmland in the Delta, the Plan incorporates the protection of farmland in recognition of its benefits to species such as Swainson's hawk and greater sandhill crane. Please see Master Response 18 for additional information regarding agricultural impacts and mitigation as proposed in the BDCP and EIR/EIS.</p> <p>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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>It is important that we protect our environment and the fragile ecosystem that makes up the Delta region.</p> <p>Thank you for allowing us to be here and state our position to stand with our local communities in opposition to the tunnels.</p>	<p>improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional discussion on the need for the proposed BDCP.</p> <p>The BDCP 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 BDCP 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. Please see Master Response 5 for additional information on how operation of the proposed CM1 would benefit fish and wildlife.</p>
450	1	<p>I am commenting because my feeling is that support of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan somehow implies that I think the rampant urban development and redevelopment in Southern California is sustainable, which I do not.</p> <p>I actually have a bachelor of science in resources from UC Davis, and it is my belief that the area essentially does not support itself. Its people do not raise food. It is essentially just a magnet for more and more population. It is an urbanization thing that is occurring in a lot of countries. And this development makes life on the planet more energy intensive.</p> <p>I do not think that the Delta can be sacrificed. I think it will start on the desertification of the state. I am really very concerned that Pyramid Lake and the other one down on the California Water Project are 87 percent full. And the Sacramento Region is looking at a huge problem with Lake Folsom.</p> <p>I used to drive trucks over the Grapevine and even talked with other truck drivers that could not believe dependency. How long would L.A. last if there was not a continuous infusion of resources from around the country and around the world. I do not think that a plan that is going to create more apparent availability of water is really going to create any better living or prospects for the people of California either north or south.</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>Chapter 30, Section 30.1.3, Urban Land Use and Water Use by Hydrologic Region, 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS, describes long-term water demand in the hydrologic regions based on projections from the California Water Plan. The chapter goes on to compare the modeled changes in deliveries associated with alternatives to the projected changes in future demand in order to evaluate the potential for the proposed project implementation to remove obstacles to growth. The proposed project does not propose any change to storage or conveyance capacity of facilities outside of the Plan Area. Thus, water diverted from new north Delta facilities would find its way into existing facilities.</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>For more information on potential growth effects due to project implementation please see Chapter 30 Growth Inducement and Other Indirect Effects of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A.</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.</p>
451	1	Who is going to pay for the cost of this?	Please see Chapter 8, Section 8.3 Funding Sources, for a description of the funding plan for BDCP.
451	2	I feel that the saltwater is going to come up too far up into the Delta because of the diversion of the water.	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

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			publication of the Draft EIR/EIS to Alternative 4A, which would have less than significant impacts on salinity-related parameters.
451	3	My other concern is corporate farmers. I understand that they are buying acre-footage of water, and that they are reselling it right back to the same district that will give them their allotment.	The proposed project does not propose any changes to rules governing transactions between contractors and individual agricultural producers.
451	4	<p>My main concern is desalinization. I spoke to several meetings of this sort in the past couple years. Whenever I mention desalinization, I did not get any answer. I look at all your literature, very minimal language of desalinization is mentioned. Why was desalinization not considered a favorite factor?</p> <p>I understand that the city of San Diego is building a desalinization plant for \$368 million, and it's going to produce ten percent of their water.</p> <p>Why has L.A. not done the same? They have had over 60 years since they built the Delta-Mendota Canal to do something. And here, 60 years later, they are trying to get a water grab, and it really did not do anything to rectify the situation we are in today in the last 60 years.</p> <p>I feel there is more water in the ocean than there is on land. Why? With global warming, we have a rise in the ocean levels. Let us use that water.</p> <p>I have flown over L.A. many times. I see a lot of green golf courses, blue pools, swimming pools, and a lot of clean cars. Where did they get that water?</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 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>
452	1	I am concerned about the impact of this project on upstream reservoirs and rivers that the reservoirs release water into. I believe that EIS/EIR should consider the alternatives that do not increase those impacts because right now there is pretty severe drainage of reservoirs and lower flows in rivers.	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).
452	2	I think a restoration plan for the Delta needs to address re-watering the San Joaquin, so that the San Joaquin becomes a contributor of fresh water to the Delta, which it is not right now because of all of its fresh water is taken by agriculture. This project does not consider that whatsoever.	<p>The San Joaquin River is being restored independent of the BDCP, so that its historic fisheries can be revived. Although the flows will not equal those that occurred prior to the construction of Friant Dam north of Fresno, the new flows under the San Joaquin River Restoration Program will represent a huge ecological improvement over conditions that have persisted over the last several decades</p> <p>As discussed in the 2013 Public Draft BDCP Chapter 3, Conservation Strategy, the San Joaquin River Restoration Program monitors the physical and biological effects of flows along the San Joaquin River from Friant Dam to the confluence of the Merced River to provide sufficient fish habitat in that area.</p> <p>The release of water from Friant Dam for the SJRRP depends upon the amount of runoff. Using water supply</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>forecasts for the Friant Division of the Central Valley Project, the SJRRP uses the estimated total unimpaired inflow below Friant Dam to determine an allocation. The Restoration Administrator makes recommendations on the timing of releases based on river conditions and the specific goals and objectives at that time. Prior to an increase in flow rates, the SJRRP analyzes the likely effects on the river and surrounding lands and documents the results with a Flow Bench Evaluation. Following an affirmative evaluation, the SJRRP issues a notification and changes the releases.</p> <p>For more information on the SJRRP please visit http://www.restoresjr.net/</p>
452	3	I think the EIS/EIR needs to do a better job about indirect impacts on protected areas in the Delta, including Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge and Delta Meadows State Park and, of course, Staten Island, the Sand Hill Crane Reserve there. So adjusting their route of the tunnels and the associated developed areas to avoid those would be a good idea, if possible.	Chapter 15 of the Draft EIR/EIS addresses potential impacts that would occur in those areas.
452	4	I think overall a smaller project should be considered, one that diverts less water into the tunnels.	Appendix 3A of the Draft EIR/EIS describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered. Refer also to Master Response 4 (Alternatives Development).
452	5	The existing pumps south of the Delta need to have fish screens on them. One of them does not. I do not know if it is the federal or state pump. If we are going to continue to use those pumps, they should have workable fish screens.	<p>DWR and Reclamation are required to improve fish collection efficiency at the existing south Delta salvage facilities, as part of facility improvements required by the National Marine Fisheries Service 2009 biological opinion on the SWP/CVP. For example, in 2014 Reclamation replaced the secondary louver system with a traveling screen system. These screens provide protection by guiding fish into the holding tanks while catching debris on pegs and transporting debris to a collection system at the work surface.</p> <p>The technology required at the proposed north Delta intakes and the existing south Delta export facilities differ fundamentally. The north Delta intakes would be located on the side of the river channel and so would be designed to comply with CDFW, NMFS, and USFWS fish screening criteria (BDCP Appendix 5B Section 3.B.3.3). The south Delta export facilities are located on dead-end channels and require active collection and salvage of fishes.</p> <p>Screening the intakes at Clifton Court Forebay was analyzed during the water conveyance alternative development process and is described in the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS, Appendix 3A. This alternative was eliminated from further evaluation because initial results of recent studies, including information included in the recent NMFS biological opinions, supported a phased approach that would emphasize improvements to operations of fish handling facilities and reduced predator potential within Clifton Court Forebay prior to further analysis of installation of fish screens. Nevertheless, DWR and Reclamation will continue investigating strategies to increase fish salvage efficiency, reduce pre-screen losses, and improve screening efficiencies, consistent with the 2009 biological opinion of the SWP/CVP.</p> <p>Please also see Master Response 28 regarding operational criteria.</p>
453	1	<p>I would just like to express my concern and hope that the fisheries are taken into consideration, not just the endangered species in the Endangered Species Act but the protection for sport fish.</p> <p>They are so important to hundreds of thousands of local citizens and not just local. In the fall run, we have thousands come from all over the state, outside the state and from all across the nation to come fish our salmon runs, sturgeon runs and striped runs.</p> <p>And -- it has a very important economic impact locally and throughout the state. It generates a tremendous amount of revenue to support the fishery programs the state and fed sponsor.</p>	<p>Effects on sportfish are described in Chapter 15, Recreation, EIR/EIS (see Impacts REC-4, REC-5, and REC-9). Implementation of 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>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
453	2	<p>The fisheries are important to our way of life. You know, many of us have been born and raised along the river, and we really treasure it. The fisheries and the sport fishing is a very important part of that.</p> <p>We really feel it is a family event. We can take our children out. We can take our fathers, our mothers, our grandmothers and all have a good time. So that is really important to a lot of people, and sometimes I feel like it is overlooked.</p> <p>The impact of sport fisheries decline because of this project would be felt not only in the highlighted areas, but hundred miles up the American River, up the Feather River, the Sacramento River and really from the San Francisco Bay to Redding.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Effects on sportfish are described in Chapter 15, Recreation, EIR/EIS (see Impacts REC-4, REC-5, and REC-9). 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. Implementation of proposed project would not be anticipated to have an adverse population-level effect on any popular sportfishing species.</p>
454	1	<p>I am a resident of Vacaville. Because Delta islands had submerged up to 25 feet below sea level due to increased Delta inflow, the one-hundred-plus-year-old foundations are seismically unsafe. Exporting water under or around the Delta could reduce the risk of catastrophic levee failure, assuring the continuation of clean water for our agricultural and urban areas. But solving the problem with cross-Delta water transfers creates even bigger ones which are mitigated only partially in the Draft EIR/EIS.</p>	<p>As discussed in Section 10.1.2.2 Causes of Subsidence, the Delta islands have subsided primarily as a result of decomposition of the organic soils, rather than from increased Delta inflows. Additionally, the primary reason that many Delta levee foundations are vulnerable to seismic shaking is because they were constructed using uncompacted, weak soil materials.</p> <p>The Plan does not purport to protect existing levees from seismic ground shaking. Although the Plan is not intended to provide enhanced flood protection, it does intend to reduce the vulnerability of the water delivery system by making it less reliant upon the Delta levee system (and associated risks thereto).</p>
454	2	<p>The Department of Water Resources has been unable to gain access to all private properties within the Delta on which it would like to conduct ground surveys. Despite resorting to the eminent domain process, they have been unable to conduct ground surveys. So that limits its findings on the impacts of all the BDCB alternatives. That is on page 4A-11 in the report.</p>	<p>This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach. A modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where the comments focused on elements of the BDCP that overlap with the elements of Alternatives 2D, 4A, or 5A (e.g., CM1 as it comprises of the North Delta Diversions, tunnels, and supporting facilities), specific responses are presented. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA's requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Where comments submitted on the BDCP were focused on elements outside the scope of the environmental analysis or viability of the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives within the context of CEQA/NEPA (e.g., request of specific revisions to the BDCP related to mapping or references), no specific responses are provided and further consideration will be given to these comments, and any revisions to the Draft BDCP would only be made, if an HCP/NCCP alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the CEQA/NEPA process.</p>
454	3	<p>The EIR/EIS chapter on Fish and Aquatic Resources shows how fragile the food chain is. There are few mitigation recommendations to ensure the continuing protection of Delta and longfin smelt, who are found in abundance in our Suisun Bay and Marsh area; and have been endangered species for the past five years. Possibly correlated with the decades long out of compliance in-flow export gap. The Delta ecosystem is the healthiest when fresh</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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		water flows in its natural directions, westward toward the San Francisco Bay. We have been redirecting the flow in a reverse direction, southward, jeopardizing the Delta.	<p>entrainment eat 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 new system would reduce the ongoing physical impacts associated with sole reliance on the southern diversion facilities and allow for greater operational flexibility to better protect fish. Minimizing south Delta pumping would provide more natural east–west flow patterns (RDEIR/SDEIS Section 4.1). Overall reductions in OMR reverse flows under all flow scenarios for the proposed project would be beneficial with corresponding increase in net positive downstream flows, during the migration period of Chinook salmon through the interior Delta channels (Appendix B, Supplemental Modeling for Alternative 4A, Section B.7 (RDEIR/SDEIS Section 4.3.7). Operations would still be consistent with the criteria set by the FWS (2008) and NMFS (2009) BiOps and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decisison 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).</p>
454	4	It has been clear for some time that the Westlands Water District and current county water agency, powerful and well-funded groups representing the interest of the San Joaquin Valley Farmers, has squandered much of the Delta export they receive on land not conducive to water efficiency. As long as the contracts for delivering 70 percent of the Delta export to this and other agencies to south remains binding, all Californians will be expected to make unnecessary sacrifices.	<p>The Proposed Project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the Proposed Project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p> <p>The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project . For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan’s strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>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>
454	5	<p>Here is the fundamental flaw in the plan: the legislative co-equal goals of water supply reliability, and Delta system restoration, are incongruent because the term reliability is not clearly defined and is assumed to mean exporting water from the Delta to the exclusion of alternatives. The real solutions to our water problem lie in those which Southern California has already implemented: recycling and groundwater cleanup. We in Northern and Central California could learn from our neighbors to the south, how to better manage our water. That would be a win for all of us.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the Proposed Project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount 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 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>
455	1	<p>I would like to recommend a book that anybody who is on the commission to read. The name of the book is Collapse. It was written about six or eight years ago, by Jared Diamond. He is a professor in the Environmental Science Department at UCLA in Los Angeles. He talks just about this kind of stuff, and I think his insights are worthy of being read by the commissioner. Our future in California is dependent on water. For the last hundred years, we have had up and down water years and the Delta has continued to suffer. We can't</p>	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental impact analysis provided in the EIR/EIS documentation.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		continue the current push for unfettered growth: north, south, and in the central part of the state. This idea that more is better, more houses, more freeways, means water that we cannot count on.	
455	2	I am very much in favor of the Garamendi plan, as it is a way to resurrect the Delta. Also, I would like very much to talk about what's called new water; some call it recycled water.	<p>Congressman Garamendi's Water Plan feasibility is discussed in Appendix 3A, Section 3A.11.2, Congressman Garamendi's Water Plan, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS.</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, 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>
455	3	I would like very much for the commission to look into -- I know it is not in the Delta -- but desalination plant, south and along the coast and any bay that can handle it. Australia does it. Israel does it. Chile does it.	<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>
455	4	The conversation plan is -- the Garamendi plan is a good plan, but I think that we need, when this is finalized, to have some sort of a committee that is State wide. That it's not just centering on the Delta, but water use in California for the next hundred years or so. Thank you.	<p>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.</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 official public review process for the Public Draft EIR/EIS and Recirculated Draft/Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS provided this commenter an opportunity for formal public comment on the Proposed Project and project alternatives. Public and agency comments will likely lead to further refinement of the Proposed Project.</p> <p>For more information regarding water storage please see Master Response 37.</p>
456	1	The Lost Tax Revenue of the farming community in Solano County, where is it going to be reimbursed from? Or how will it be reimbursed? Honestly, I think that is about it. I am concerned about the tax revenue that Solano County gets from farmland that is being restored to wetlands. Where is the revenue supposed to come from, then?	<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>Property tax revenue effects of land acquisitions required for construction of water conveyance facilities are discussed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, Impact ECON-4, EIR/EIS. As discussed for this impact under each alternative, the project proponents would make arrangements to compensate local governments for the loss of property tax or assessment revenue for land used for constructing, locating, operating, or mitigating for</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>new Delta water conveyance facilities. Notably, California Water Code section 85089 provides that “[c]onstruction of a new Delta conveyance facility shall not be initiated” until the benefitting federal and state water contractors, or a joint powers authority representing them, have made arrangements or entered into contracts requiring them to pay for both (a) the “costs of the environmental review, planning, design, construction, and mitigation” required for such a facility and (b) “[f]ull mitigation of property tax or assessments levied by local governments or special districts for land use in the construction, location, mitigation, or operation of new Delta conveyance facilities.”</p> <p>Similarly, for land acquired for habitat restoration measures under the environmental commitments (see Impact ECON-16), project proponents would compensate local governments and special districts for forgone revenue.</p> <p>As a result, although land would be removed from the local tax base for project purposes, local governments and special districts would be compensated for lost property tax revenues.</p>
457	1	All the water problems in this agency, agencies -- there are many of them out here all involved in it, but primarily for the farmers in LA and our own area. All we have to do is build a diversion dam on the Columbia River, build a pipeline, or use existing rivers to transfer the water from the Columbia River, which dumps billions of gallons of fresh water into the ocean every day. Problem solved.	<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, 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>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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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>
458	1	I am writing to you today to stop the water project, Bay Delta Conservation Plan. It is an ironic name for a project which could destroy which we now cherish in California as the Delta, the Sacramento River, and the San Francisco Bay. I fear for the health and future of your entire state.	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.
458	2	I have never written to my elective officials before I heard about this project. As a third generation native Californian with three children of my own, I feel obligated to do so. A project of this scale needs to have the approval of our entire state by putting it to a popular vote. To do otherwise would circumvent our democratic process. I cannot believe how many people in California are completely unaware of this project. Its price, size, and scope should be made known to all Californians. I am writing to you to say it appears this project is slowly working up its momentum out of the reach of public opinion and scrutiny. If it cannot pass the sniff test and the court of public opinion, it is not worthy of becoming a solution for California's water needs.	<p>For information pertaining to project approval, please refer to 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> <p>For information pertaining to how the BDCP/California WaterFix has been developed in an open and transparent manner and the public outreach conducted, please refer to Master Responses 40 and 41.</p>
458	3	This project is hastily moving forward in the wrong direction. Here in our beautiful state we are accustomed to being the leader of our nation and world on important issues, like, health, climate change, innovation, and conservation. Here is an opportunity to show the world, again, that we can lead on an issue which is important to all humanity: clean water. Draining the Sacramento River basin with two huge tunnels is wrong. We can do so much better than this ill-advised water grab. Our Sacramento River and its tributaries, the heart, heartbeat, and blood lines for our entire state. The consequences of playing with mother nature on such a scale can have many unseen and unwanted consequences. For this price, and for the importance of clean water for all, we should be pulling our collective resources to find solutions that will last for centuries, not just a couple decades. Look at the water and Sierras today. Where is it? With climate change, our reliance on a winter snow pack is looking less and less feasible.	<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 to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <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> <p>For more information regarding alternatives to the proposed project please see Master Response 4.</p>
458	4	We have the talent and ability to be leaders on this front. Putting these tunnels in the Sacramento River is being nearsighted and, frankly, lazy. We have other, more sustainable options including: desalination, re-use, recycling, rain collection, efficiencies, monitoring ground water, landscape alternatives, and the emerging technologies. We should be putting these into place instead of adding more water to an antiquated system of wasteful water consumption. We can roll up our sleeves and put together a comprehensive package of	<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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		water use, storage, and supply that can be a model for the rest of our country and the world to follow. We are Californians. We can do this. We owe it to our families and future generations to do so. So please stop the tunnels on our Delta.	<p>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, 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>
459	1	<p>The Bay Delta Conservation Plan has missed what has always seemed to me a very obvious set of options to improve the fishery and to improve the delivery of water for agriculture and domestic purposes and to support the Bay Delta area.</p> <p>The first option, which seems stunning to me, that has never been considered, is to simply build very large fish ladders to the height of 300 feet, or whatever is necessary to completely bypass the Central Valley Project dams, such as Oroville and Shasta, Keswick, et cetera. Essentially allow the fish to swim all the way around those dams, have a small check dam above the high water of those reservoirs with a screen to divert the fish into this bypass canal.</p> <p>This would open up all of the now inaccessible small cold mountain streams where the fish had naturally spawned prior to the building of these dams. We did not know or understand the complete aspect of the impacts of those reservoirs back in the forties and fifties when they were building them. Now we do. The fish cannot get past them. They cannot possibly get upstream in those native headwaters to spawn, and the multitude of fish spawning facilities we have simply cannot replace literally hundreds of miles of creeks and river that the fish can no longer access.</p> <p>So build a fish ladder and go around those reservoirs. It will be expensive but if we truly want to preserve the fishery and riparian mammals and birds that use them for food source, this is the way to do it. Do not try and put a band-aid on it, fix it.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the development of alternatives and Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. While the Lead Agencies agree that fish ladders can provide beneficial effects for passage of migratory species, the purpose and need for the project is specifically focused on achieving the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration in the Delta.</p>
459	2	<p>If we build fish ladders that bypass those dams, well, we can extract those waters additionally, not just for the fish, but we can build Central Valley Project irrigation canals that start at much higher elevations than they currently do. That will have the course of running on the western slope of the Sierra Nevada southward. The benefits of those are multiple. It will make it able for the Central Valley Project and the other state water</p>	<p>Please see response to Comment 459-1.</p> <p>For more information regarding alternatives to the proposed project please see Master Response 4.</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>projects to irrigate many more acres in the northern half of the great valley.</p> <p>The Bay Delta will be avoided entirely because the diversion takes place a hundred and some miles north of the whole Bay Delta complex. It runs on the western slope of the Sierra Nevada and does not come anywhere near the bay.</p> <p>It will reduce the need for pumping because by starting the canal five or six hundred feet higher in elevation than the diversion currently at Red Bluff, you will not have to pump it an extra three hundred feet to get it to Southern California. Obviously enough, starting at a higher elevation, you will not need to have a canal with a one and two thousand or so slope which needs to be very, very wide so you have less friction losses.</p> <p>You can have a canal that is much smaller visual footprint, much smaller physically overall that would cost quite a bit less per mile than the proposals, either its 40-foot tunnel or the seven or eight hundred foot wide canal that is one of their proposals currently under consideration.</p>	
460	1	<p>I am with the Winnemem Wintu tribe. If they raise the Shasta Dam to fill the twin tunnels, they are going to flood a lot of our sacred sites, and more villages and more burials, and they already did that once when they built the Shasta Dam. We had an Act of Congress in 1941, and they did not honor that at all.</p> <p>I think they should honor that Act of Congress. They hid it for 50 years, and it should be honored. I do not think we should go through this devastation again for the greater good because we already did it once.</p> <p>We still have ceremonies on that river, on the McCloud River. We still go there all the time, go to our sacred sites, do our ceremonies there. We dance, sing, fast and pray there all the time. It is not in the past, it is ongoing. We are a traditional tribe and we cannot go through that again. I just want them to honor the 1941 Act of Congress.</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, 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>For more information regarding cultural resources please see Master Response 20.</p> <p>For more information regarding water storage please see Master Response 37.</p>
461	1	<p>I just wanted to say that I am opposed to the BDCP. I think it is not cost effective and that it will do too much destruction to the river and to the estuaries and to the Delta.</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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		I think we are being sold a bill of goods that the public cannot afford it. It's another boondoggle that our taxpayers and water users just cannot afford. We should not have to ration our budgets so we can afford to have a glass of water with dinner. With the plan, that is what would happen.	<p>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 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.</p>
461	2	I am opposed to the BDCP because of the way it will destroy the estuaries. If you take that much fresh water out of the Delta from above the top of the Sacramento River like they are planning, the salt water will intrude too far, and you cannot farm in salty lands, and that is what is going to happen. That and the salmon hatcheries will be destroyed. Too much land will be destroyed with the building of the tunnels.	Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. The project would not affect upstream water rights or Table A amounts; instead, it is designed to be a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. Future water deliveries from the federal and state water projects are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years with project implementation. Refer to Master Response 26 for possible effects to northern California. By establishing an alternative diversion point for exports, a great deal of water management flexibility is added. This flexibility would provide more options for adaptively managing the Delta so that conditions can be optimized to provide the greatest benefits across all Delta water uses and habitat conditions. 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 BDCP. 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 action alternatives would be able to completely counteract all of the impacts of climate change. More information on ways in which the BDCP proposes to improve resiliency and adaptability of the Delta to climate change can be found in Chapter 29, Climate Change, Draft EIR/EIS and Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, Draft EIR/EIS and for the new sub-alternatives in Section 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Additionally, refer to Master Response 19 (Climate Change and GHG).
461	3	We as a people of the state cannot afford it. There are cheaper ways to restore the Delta, fix the levees and make fat levees. Tell people to conserve. Do not farm in the alkaline desert, the west San Joaquin valley. Too much land is going to be going fallow anyway because of the salinity problem, and there is no way for the toxic to be cleared out anyhow. You know, you cannot make water. There is only so much water, and the corporate farmers are just going to have to start farming where it is viable and not try and farm the desert	<p>The proposed project is costly, but the lead agencies have assessed the benefits as described in the BDCP funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those facilities. Expenditures of public money from other sources would be limited to restoration activities beyond those needed to mitigate the impacts of facility construction. BDCP Chapter 8, which deals with cost issues, and cost-benefit analysis information are available on the BDCP website. Please see Master response 5 for more information on project costs and funding.</p> <p>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>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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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>
462	1	<p>The plan as written does not critically evaluate the evaporation loss from the water distribution canals in California. This is something that needs to be done, as India right now is covering canals for both energy and water, as they put solar panels on top of their canal covers.</p> <p>This covering of the canals would produce significant new water, estimates from a graduate student at Chico State calculating the water saved from the six-million-acre feet to four-million-acre feet that goes to the California aqueduct, depending on the amount of water that you have in a given year would save, covering that stretch would save between 2- and 2.8 million feet of water. This is a significant amount of water, and if translated to the All-American Canal, the Glenn Colusa aqueduct, the Mendota Canal, and other canals in the State could produce more water than you were proposing to produce through your groundwater banking, your new reservoirs raising, and all of this.</p> <p>This is something that could be done quickly, whereas your projects are going to take significant amount of time to implement and is going to meet lots of legal challenges, which is going to significantly extend the time you could even start.</p>	<p>Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed and Master Response 6 regarding water demand management.</p> <p>New energy generation facilities are outside the scope of the BDCP ; however, nothing in the BDCP would prevent other entities from pursuing innovative approaches to water conservation or energy production.</p>
462	2	<p>Covering canals and putting potable tanks, leasing the canal space to private entrepreneurship provides the money that the State and Federal budgets don't have to accomplish this. It would generate new money by leasing the canal space and new water and new energy.</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:</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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>
462	3	All of your proposed projects require new energy for pumping costs and new water for storage and injection in the groundwater. This would provide the means to give you both the new water and the new energy to complete your plans in the future as California needs to expand into your proposals.	Please see response to Comment 462-1. See Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS for additional information regarding surface water and groundwater storage. As described in Chapter 21, Energy, EIR/EIS, the SWP will procure power and capacity for BDCP through long-term and mid-term contracts, and the CAISO power markets, sufficient to meet the power and Resource Adequacy capacity requirements of the California Independent System Operator DWR's Resource Adequacy Program. The potential for new or expanded electrical power generation facilities is therefore not discussed in Chapter 21, as it will be addressed through SWP power purchase programs.
462	4	India is doing it, covering canals for both water saving and electricity generation.	Please see response to Comment 462-1.
463	1	The tribes have not been included in the environmental assessment, the tribes as to what it would do, especially the Winnem tribe. They have never been reimbursed for the land that they lost when Shasta Dam was raised, and now this would take another large chunk of their sacred areas on the McCloud River. Tribes have not been consulted. This should have been assessed in the environmental impact assessment.	<p>The proposed project does not propose any changes to the operation or footprint of Shasta Dam, nor is the Plan anticipated to have any effects on the McCloud River.</p> <p>The Lead Agencies began formal tribal consultation in April 2014. As of late June, the Lead Agencies had held three consultation meetings (in Corning, Sacramento, and Clovis). Additionally, DWR is looking into the possibility of forming a tribal working group and is coordinating with local tribes to identify specific cultural sites within the Plan Area.</p>
463	2	It is an unusually expensive plan that benefits mainly wetlands or the huge agricultural businesses and water districts. They have yet to pay 50 percent of the money that they owe for the Central Valley Project. They have not paid it off. So that is another point.	<p>The project will provide a wide range of benefits to water users, natural communities, covered species, and the State of California as a whole. Benefits are not limited to one type of water user and/or type of habitat as suggested in this comment. The State Water Project (SWP) and Central Valley Project (CVP) provide and distribute water to urban and agricultural water suppliers in northern California, the San Francisco Bay Area, the San Joaquin Valley, the central coast, and southern California and provide water for agriculture, urban, industrial and wildlife users in California. The proportion of water provided by SWP and CVP provided to urban vs. agricultural users varies from year to year. Generally a larger proportion of the water provided by SWP (approximately 70%) is delivered to urban or industrial users and CVP primarily serves agricultural users.</p> <p>In addition to the benefits of the project to urban, industrial, and agricultural water users, the project is expected to provide a wide range of ecological benefits. The project will benefit the 56 covered species. Constructing new water diversion points in the north Delta with state-of-the-art fish screens and providing a means to transport water supplies under the Delta, rather than through sensitive natural channels, would help maintain reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California's population while balancing the needs of the Delta ecosystem. Because it is a Habitat Conservation Plan and Natural Community Conservation Plan it would also implement habitat restoration actions to protect and promote recovery for all 56 species it covers.</p> <p>There would also be direct and indirect economic benefits of the proposed project. Reliable water supplies gained through project implementation will protect and save an estimated 980,722 statewide jobs. In</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>addition, construction of the water facilities and habitat restoration projects will create an estimated 155,090 jobs in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Delta) region.</p> <p>For additional discussion of public benefits and funding, see Master Response 5.</p>
463	3	These huge agriculture farms are getting subsidized water. I would like to say that smaller farms, farms that -- everybody over five-hundred-acre farms should not get subsidized water.	<p>The proposed project does not make determinations regarding how water conveyed through the proposed project, California Aqueduct, Delta Mendota Canal, or other water conveyance facilities is put to a beneficial use. Contractors and their customers must make economic decisions about planting in light of the amounts of water they are likely to receive going forward.</p> <p>For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.</p>
463	4	<p>The channels as they are now that the water goes through, why not use innovation. Why not stop the evaporation, for example, by putting photovoltaic cells (solar cells) to cover the channels, existing channels of water, while producing energy.</p> <p>So you stop the evaporation, plus you produce energy for the state. And I think that all of the options they have now is just like a mining. It's just mining more water, instead of looking at innovation of how to make more water.</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>
463	5	<p>Having groundwater, using -- some of the groundwater is polluted, so unpolluting it. What do you call those plants that clear it, clear groundwater that -- you are not helping me.</p> <p>Oh, groundwater -- groundwater detoxification plants or something. Desalinization plants or gray water systems, where you capture water that is there and you clean it. You recycle it.</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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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>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.</p> <p>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 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 allow 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 BDCP water conveyance alternatives can be found in Appendix A Chapter 7 of the RDEIR/SDIES.</p>
463	6	<p>For this huge amount of money, there is just not enough recycling, reusing of old water, cisterns capturing water. Innovation to make -- to find uses of more water instead of just trying to take more and more.</p> <p>So it is just the mining mentality of taking more. I do not like any of these plans.</p>	<p>The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>Although components such as desalination plants and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. It is important to note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives (such as desalination or water storage) that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and water conservation.</p>
463	7	<p>This project is not going to help fish. The nets that they are using for these large tunnels have not been demonstrated to prevent fish from being sucked in there and being killed. Taking more water from the Upper Sacramento does not seem a plan, to me, that it would help salmon or any of the fish. They [are] not shutting down anything in south -- in the South Delta. They just have two areas now where they can take the water. So I do not think it is going to help the fish.</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 positive-barrier fish screens for the proposed north Delta intakes would be designed to established protection standards for salmonids and delta smelt, and would comply with CDFW, NMFS, and USFWS fish screening criteria. Appendix 3F of the PD EIR/S provides details on the development of intakes and fish screening technology, as well as the Conceptual Engineering Reports (CERs). It is proposed that monitoring and research would be conducted to inform the fish screen design, construction, and operation in order to maximize their effectiveness. Dual operations provides for flexibility that will better protect the fish based on real time data.</p>
464	1	<p>I am very concerned about the fish screen at the Clifton Court Forebay. I have seen it in the past and all of the -- heard a lot of the complaints that they never improved the fish screens and the fact that the fish are trapped in there and cause problems for everybody. I am really, really curious to know why there has been no change in that fish screen all of these years. If a fish screen in situ is not feasible at this time, then why do they not just move the water around or move the intake to a more favorable location that would provide the safety for the fish? There is a lot of ground down there and lot of water down there. So I am sure that some accommodation for those fish could be made other than what there is today.</p> <p>My newspaper said that there is no plan to put in a new fish screen at Clifton Court Forebay for the old pump. So I would really like to know the answer to these questions: Why have they not changed the fish screen all of these years? Is there a better fish screen available? If there is not, why can they not rearrange the access point or access multiple points to improve the fish screening?</p>	<p>DWR is required to improve salvage efficiency (including reducing prescreen losses across Clifton Court Forebay) as part of compliance with the NMFS (2009) CWP/CVP biological opinion; changes in fish screen design are not proposed as part of any of the alternatives assessed in the DEIR/SDEIS, or the RDEIR/SDEIS that was developed and circulated in 2015, including 3 new Alternatives including the new preferred alternative, 4A (see further discussion of Initial Screening Conveyance Alternative C4 in Appendix 3A of the DEIR/EIS). The evaluation of the effects of Alternative 4A are included in the RDEIR/SDEIS. Alternative 4A includes localized reduction of predatory fish in Clifton Court Forebay and environmental commitment to mitigate for project effects. However, fish screens are not the only issue at Clifton Court Forebay. More fundamental is that the complexity of Delta channels and reverse-flow conditions bring fish into the area and then make return difficult or impossible so that they are subject to predation as well as entrainment. There are several components of the alternatives that address Clifton Court Forebay concerns including entrainment, Old River and Middle River reverse flows and water quality. The north Delta diversions proposed under Alternative 4A (and other alternatives) allow the reduction in use of the south Delta diversions and more operational flexibility to minimize reverse flows, movement of fish to Clifton Court Forebay and the south Delta pumps and consequent entrainment. These effects of issues on each fish species under each alternative are addressed using the best available data and models. For example, see the discussion under the impacts titled 'Effects of Water Operations on Entrainment of ...' and 'Effects of Water</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Operations on Migration Conditions for...' under each alternative.
464	2	<p>I understand that when they catch fish and return them to the river, they are taking them back to the same spot. Well, all wild animals know where their food source is. So they have to keep moving those sites around. You do not have to be a wild animal to know where your food is coming from. And I know the food is coming from the Delta there.</p> <p>It's California's green spot, and we would sure like to keep it a green spot. You fly from Southern California to Northern California, it is all dry and brown. And when you get close to the delta, suddenly it's green. It has been that way for about 100 or more years now. Let us keep the food coming out of the Delta.</p>	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
464	3	I have a lot of relatives in Southern California, and they need to understand actually what is happening with the water. They can only have excess water out of the northern part of the state. So that is why they are having trouble understanding why there is no more water. It is only excess water that they can have.	<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 Proposed Project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the Proposed Project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p> <p>For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.</p>
465	1	Some of our concerns were water flow and the salinity. In years such as now with a drought and already the tide inflow is increased over the regular tide of the flow of the water, so as water is diverted, we are worried about that drawing up more salinity into our channel. We are on the Georgiana Slough. So we would think that that would really affect our wildlife, our vegetation, that sort of thing.	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 compliance with related agricultural and fish and wildlife 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 agricultural and fish and wildlife 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.
465	2	I am really concerned with a reverse flow from the San Joaquin flowing into the Sacramento, as opposed to the Sacramento flowing through the San Joaquin through the Georgiana Slough. So my concern is with the backflow issue and also the salinity issue. If we do create a backflow, what is that going to do? Is that going to bring salt water up then from the San Joaquin and then kill all of our plant life on the banks? I am a little concerned with that.	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 compliance with related agricultural and fish and wildlife 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 agricultural and fish and wildlife 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.
465	3	We are concerned that the scope of the water flow is just through modelling, not real life aspects. We know that the best case scenario, the best modelling never can 100 percent reflect how it is in real life. So what are the contingencies? What are the things that will	Considerable scientific uncertainty exists regarding the Delta ecosystem, including the effects of CVP and SWP operations and the related operational criteria. To address this uncertainty, DWR, Reclamation, DFW, USFWS, NMFS, and the public water agencies will establish a robust program of collaborative science,

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		happen if they find that even to the best of their ability there are problems arising?	<p>monitoring, and adaptive management. It is assumed the Collaborative Science and Adaptive Management Program (AMMP) developed for Alternative 4A would not, by itself, create nor contribute to any new significant environmental effects; instead, the AMMP would influence the operation and management of facilities and protected or restored habitat associated with Alternative 4A.</p> <p>Collaborative science and adaptive management will support the proposed action by helping to address scientific uncertainty where it exists, and as it relates to the benefits and impacts of the construction and operations of the new water conveyance facility and existing CVP and SWP facilities.</p> <p>The collaborative science effort is expected to inform operational decisions within the ranges established by the biological opinion and 2081b permit for the proposed action. However, if new science suggests that operational changes may be appropriate that fall outside of the operational ranges evaluated in the biological opinion and authorized by the 2081b permit, the appropriate agencies will determine, within their respective authorities, whether those changes should be implemented. An analysis of the biological effects of any such changes will be conducted to determine if those effects fall within the range of effects analyzed and authorized under the biological opinion and 2081b permit. If NMFS, USFWS, or DFW determine that impacts to listed species are greater than those analyzed and authorized under the biological opinion and 2081b 41 Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix permit, consultation may need to be reinitiated and/or the permittees may need to seek a 2081b permit amendment. Likewise, if an analysis shows that impacts to water supply are greater than those analyzed in the EIR/EIS, it may be necessary to complete additional environmental review to comply with CEQA or NEPA.</p> <p>For more information regarding adaptive management please see Master Response 33.</p>
465	4	It was also the Delta's recreation ability and if the BDCP will be lowering the flow. You know, is it lowering the flow during the prime time when boaters are out? That brings the economy to us in the Delta. So if that is inhibited, that is a huge cut to all of us. That is a concern.	<p>The Draft EIR/EIS does consider impacts to recreation. The impacts and proposed mitigation on recreational uses in the Delta can be found in Chapter 15, Recreation, Draft EIR/EIS. Although there are some impacts on water-based recreation, the Delta will continue to support recreation even during the construction period, and definitely after construction activities are ended.</p> <p>The Draft EIR/EIS analysis indicates that annual water diversions from the Delta would be within 10 percent of the historic, 20-year average. Water levels in the south Delta area under the BDCP are expected to be approximately 12 to 18 inches higher than under Existing Conditions, as shown in Appendix 5A Tables C-27-1-5 to C-27-1-8, EIR/EIS, primarily due to sea level rise; and up to 4 inches higher than under the No Action Alternative, as shown in Appendix 5A Tables C-27-1-17 to C-27-2-20, EIR/EIS (sea level rise occurs in both the BDCP and No Action Alternative by Year 2060).</p>
465	5	We have a lot of concerns. We hope it works for the best. We are worried that once this is in place that the powers that be may change and different rules and regulations -- and even though we started out with a certain contingency and regulations for the water flow, it may change in the future and really change the Delta. So we are very concerned about that as well.	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 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 28 concerning operational criteria.
465	6	If this project -- the size of this project, the enormous implications it could have on this area. Why is the Sierra Club not involved and how come they are not 100 percent with this project?	The Proposed Project and its alternatives were developed from sound science based on extensive modeling and ongoing peer review by Lead Agency scientists and independent science panels. Input was received from regulating governmental agencies, topic experts, stakeholders, private organizations like the Sierra Club, and the general public during the developmental phase of this document since 2006. 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

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Lead Agencies, the Agencies' scientists have been intimately involved, and their judgments are reflected throughout the EIR/EIS and the proposed project itself.
466	1	<p>I am president of Reclamation District 813.</p> <p>The only comment I've got to make right now is we need more than 120 days to go through this document and -- at least a year, because you put this thing together in the last couple years. And you're only giving us 120 days. And we are working people, and we have to come up with answers to this.</p> <p>So please give us more than - at least a year on this project.</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, plain language 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 38 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 39 for more information about the public review period.</p>
467	1	<p>Mega state public works projects should be just that, large-scale projects planned and built to benefit as many Californians as possible. They should result in a worthwhile investment by taxpayers as they fulfill their original purpose over the long term.</p> <p>They should not be planned and built to benefit a few powerfully political people for their own personal regional gain. They should not be massively overdone expensive and unneeded projects that end up being unable to do and deliver as promised. They should not be forced upon the people who will ultimately pay for them.</p> <p>California's purposed Bay Delta Conversation Plan in its current form will do all of that.</p>	<p>The issues raised about the commenter addresses the merits of the project and conservation plan alternatives and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project (Alternative 4A, which does not include an HCP/NCCP) is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Funding).</p>
467	2	<p>The biggest, most costly and foolhardy section of this plan is its insistence on building the twin peripheral tunnels.</p> <p>These purposed tunnels would be mega big, each 40 feet in diameter. Why so big? Why such a greedy-sized water diversion of undeliverable proportion? Costly, oh, yes, they would be.</p> <p>Any dollar amount thrown out, such as 17 billion, would end up far in excess of the original bid. Where are these budget-breaking funds going to come from? We need solid financial answers.</p>	<p>This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach. A modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where the comments focused on elements of the BDCP that overlap with the elements of Alternatives 2D, 4A, or 5A (e.g., CM1 as it comprises of the North Delta Diversions, tunnels, and supporting facilities), specific responses are presented. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA's requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Where comments submitted on the BDCP were focused on elements outside the scope of the environmental analysis or viability of the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives within the context of CEQA/NEPA (e.g., request of specific revisions to the BDCP related to mapping or references), no specific responses are provided and further consideration will be given to these comments, and any revisions to the Draft BDCP would only be made, if an HCP/NCCP alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the CEQA/NEPA process.</p>
467	3	<p>Foolhardy, most certainly. Many prominent people in the state are calling this water plan outright fraud, an economic and environmental disaster, a political boondoggle, an ill-conceived project with fatal flaws, and the descriptions go on.</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>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <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>
467	4	<p>State officials must seriously consider omitting the tunnels from the current plan or scrap the project entirely and begin anew. A no-tunnel plan would combine many habitat elements currently proposed with long-term water exports. Without the expensive cost of building the tunnels, an updated plan could instead invest funding into levee repairs and improvements, smaller regional waterworks projects, statewide water conservation practices, promoting drip irrigation for crops, recycled water for crops, among many other suggestions.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the range of alternatives selected.</p> <p>The alternatives included in the Draft EIR/EIS represent a legally adequate reasonable range of alternatives and the scope of the analysis of alternatives fully complies with both CEQA and NEPA. The Lead Agencies carefully all potential alternatives that were proposed during the scoping process and during time of preparation of the Draft EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Although components such as desalination plants and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. It is important to note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Please refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation. Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that they required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
467	5	<p>All and all, our state needs a better way to manage our precious dwindling water resources for a much less cost than the tunnels would be. Mismanaged water diversions and allocations are at the root of our current water woes, as is overuse of watering by agriculture and homeowners alike.</p> <p>Too much water is going into arid marginal regions of our valley. Too much water is leaving our northern reservoirs. Too much water is being pumped out of our area rivers and deltas.</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>For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.</p>
467	6	Please do not move forward with the current plan as it is proposed now. It cannot fulfill its many empty promises, especially based on the assumption there is and will be surplus water	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

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		in the delta to export, which there is not now nor will there be in the foreseeable future. The tunnels will not create any new water source and would be of zero use in dry, drought-stricken years.	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 plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. With respect to the drought problem, the proposed intakes would only be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. Flow criteria would be applied month by month and according to water year type. More information on the ranges of water project diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in BDCP, Chapter 3, Conservation Strategy. Monitoring for compliance with D-1641 requirements or any future requirements for SWP/CVP water supply operations would be conducted year-round in the future under the proposed project.
467	7	Please do not be politically swayed by the interests of a few California growers, and please do not destroy the most important and critically vital estuary on the entire west coast of America.	The project process has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole and not as a result of large corporations. In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority concerning what crops to plant. The commenter is also referred to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water) for other issues raised.
468	1	I was not really understanding getting enough information as far as the seismic effects of driving these pilings in and so forth. I have heard one thing and I have heard another thing. What will the effects will be on, say, the levees, because it is constant vibration and so support, just how that will affect the levee integrity.	As discussed in the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS Chapter 9, Geology and Seismicity, Impact GEO-5, pile driving and other heavy equipment operations would cause vibrations that could initiate liquefaction and associated ground movements in places where soil and groundwater conditions are present to allow such movements to occur. The movements could result in compaction, settlement, loss of bearing capacity, and lateral spreading of the levee material, thereby causing levee failure. Also described are the codes and standards that would be adhered to with respect to pile driving and the measures that would be implemented to minimize the potential for construction-induced liquefaction and other ground movements. Additionally, if the proposed project makes any modification to a levee that is part of the federal flood control system, the proposed project proponents must secure approval from USACE through the Section 408 permitting process. See BDCP Appendix 6A the BDCP and flood control in the Delta.
468	2	Another concern I have is, during harvest time of crops and so forth, is it guaranteed that there will not be any obstructions with the flow of traffic? Because things like pears or tomatoes or grapes are perishable and need to get to the processor as soon as possible. Otherwise, they could be rejected and the farmer would lose the whole load, you know, truck load. What is the process or protocol? Is it in place to make sure that that does not happen, that the highway stays open?	The Lead Agencies acknowledge the importance of Delta roads to the agricultural economy. Mitigation Measure TRANS-1b specifies limiting construction activity to hours with more capacity to avoid operational deficiencies on affected roadways. Mitigation Measure TRANS-1c also seeks to work with affected jurisdictions to enhance capacity of congested roadway segments where construction traffic will substantially affect transportation facilities. It should be noted that the overall traffic volumes would be lower during the hours between 7 PM and 6 AM, but the project proponents acknowledge that construction truck traffic may impact the local community (residents, schools, and farmers). Therefore, Mitigation Measure TRANS-2c includes coordination with affected agencies to address impacts of construction truck traffic to local farmers before 6 AM in the morning and after 7 PM in the evening. However, some significant impacts may be unavoidable as discussed on page 19-70 of BDCP EIR/EIS Chapter 19, Transportation.
468	3	For compensation for any damages, I understand that during these kinds of efforts that there are compensations for damages, and what is the model that you use for these claimed losses and damages? Who will administer that? Is there a review process if we don't agree on the compensation?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
469	1	I am concerned about the water being carried away from northern California down to a desert where farmers are trying to farm and they have run out of water, and we are running out of water also, which means then, my well is going to go dry, like their wells went dry already. So what is going to happen with my well going dry? Who do I get water from? That means there is not going to be enough water in this area to have a well.	Chapter 7 of the Draft EIR/EIS evaluates groundwater supplies and impacts, along with Appendix A (Chapter 7) and Section 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. The plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Also, refer to Master Responses: Master Response 3 (Purpose and

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Need) and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
469	2	I am also concerned about the amount of noise pollution that is going to be happening when the pumps are being built to pull the water out of the river. They are going to be within a quarter of a mile from my house, same thing with the well going dry. It is going to be within that time. Also, I am going to be hearing the construction noise and then later on, the pumping noise and both are extremely noisy. That is what I am concerned about.	From Appendix 3B, Section 3B.5.5: DWR and contractors hired to construct any conveyance components of the project will implement a site-specific noise abatement plan to avoid or reduce potential construction-, maintenance-, and operation-related noise impacts. This section also includes environmental commitments to reduce noise levels where exceedances are anticipated to occur.
470	1	There has not been an analysis of the impact from the truck drivers and construction workers on the community of Hood. Hood is the last of the Delta towns that does not have a sewer connection to Sacramento Regional Sewer and that should be analyzed and completed before they even get to the point of being able to consider doing this project.	Because construction of this alternative would primarily occur in rural parts of the Plan Area, and is not likely to occur in areas with municipal water service, it is not expected to impact municipal water systems. If there are no existing water lines in the vicinity, then field offices will require construction of a water tank. Water for construction will be provided by available sources to the extent possible; if needed, water may be brought to the construction sites in water trucks. Additionally, the potable water demand would be temporary and limited to the construction period. Wastewater services for construction crews would be provided by temporary portable facilities and is not anticipated to have any impact on the community of Hood as wastewater would be taken offsite to a treatment facility.
470	2	It looks like the diagrams for power have not been completed, and that, in my estimation, is extremely important to be set forth because where those power lines go will tremendously impact the land that they are above because of the large amount of power they need.	Under Alternatives 1A through 8, electrical power to operate the new north Delta pumping plant facilities would be delivered through 230 kV transmission lines that would interconnect with a local utility at a new or existing utility substation depending on the conveyance alignment. The alignment of this transmission line and its interconnection point would be based on the selection of a power provider for the project following selection of a conveyance alignment. This selection is ongoing and the alignment of the transmission lines will be finalized at a later date. Proposed locations of electrical transmission lines are shown in Figure 3-25.
470	3	There does not appear to have been any analysis as to whether boring these tunnels could effectively increase the chance of an earthquake nor have they analyzed what would happen if an earthquake occurred either during construction or after construction and what the potential cost to repair or completely replace these tunnels.	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. 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.
470	4	Probably most significantly, is the failure to do a complete economic plan to spend \$24 billion for a system to deliver water that currently doesn't exist to be sent, is not a, in their terms, feasible way, to spend your money. The money would be better spent on alternatives including conservation, underground storage, increased dam height, desalinization, and scientific review of alternative plans that would not include a total disruption of the Delta community.	DWR is revising its Statewide Economic Impact Report, 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. Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives (such as desalination or water storage) that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and water conservation.
471	1	I am really disappointed that our government feels that they are above the laws and they do not have to notify the owners of the marinas and businesses in the Delta by registered mail that their businesses may be in great jeopardy.	The Lead Agencies have provided all public notices required by law under both the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in the preparation and publication of the Public Draft BDCP EIR/S and RDEIR/RSEIS. Additional public notice to potentially interested stakeholders, beyond what is required by law, was also provided through an extensive scoping process which included public notice and public participation, the placement of copies of the environmental documents for review

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>at 125 libraries throughout the state and through six public comment hearings which were held throughout the Plan Area. Overall, more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings have been held during the preparation of the BDCP and the BDCP EIR/S. All of the documents, studies, administrative drafts and meeting materials – more than 3,000 documents in total, have also been posted online in an unprecedented commitment to public access and government transparency. Further, 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, providing translators upon request to respond to requests, and having a Spanish-language translator at every open house public meeting on the Draft EIR/S and Draft BDCP among other efforts.</p> <p>For more information regarding public outreach efforts please see Master Response 40.</p>
471	2	I am ashamed of my government, state and federal, for the way they have treated the Delta people. They treat the farmers like they are a dot on a map. They are wasting millions of dollars of money that could be better spent. They have literally tunnel vision because they are not listening to more reasonable, less expensive alternatives that would be excellent compromises suitable for everyone to make peace instead of war in the Delta.	<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 to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <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>
472	1	<p>My concerns are that even though they state that the same amount of water would be diverted, I do not believe that that is true. Why would they have this kind of a large project and not be planning on increasing flow of the water?</p> <p>It very much disturbs me the way they have put in conservation as a way to get around, as a way to not have this go to voters. I think that it's very sneaky. I'm very much against this. I think this would be a huge detriment to the waterways in San Joaquin County and Sacramento.</p> <p>If they are just going to be pumping the same amount as before, then there is no reason to do this. If they need a more stable amount of water flow, they should be looking at conserving the water they have, like covering up the aqueduct so they do not get so much evaporation. That would save lots of water. It just does not pass the smell test.</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. 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 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 project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Conservation Strategy, BDCP (page 3.4-17). 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. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Costs of Implementation and Funding). As noted in DWR's 2015 Bulletin 132-13 (Table 9-9), total water losses attributed to evaporation, seepage, and other maintenance/ operational changes led to 212,035 acre-feet between the years 1992-2012. This amount is not sufficient to provide consistent reliability to the existing SWP/CVP water supply delivery system. Covering the SWP entails many factors including impacts to recreation, water quality, aquatic resources, along with changes to existing legislation and incurring substantial costs. DWR continues to reassess plans for additional facilities that will incorporate increased environmental safeguards, while also increasing SWP delivery yield (including the reduction in evaporative losses from the conveyance/ distribution systems throughout the SWP). Developing these plans involves the time-consuming process of finding technically</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>suitable projects and satisfying many complex and dynamic environmental procedures, laws, and regulations. Meantime, DWR continually monitors all SWP facilities and performs repairs, modifications, and inspections as necessary to ensure safe, reliable water delivery while reducing, whenever possible, seepage and evaporation losses.</p>
472	2	<p>It would be nice to be conserving all this water, but that is just a vehicle of a way to get around the voters' wrath, basically. It has nothing to do with really helping the water supplies in California. It would be nice if what they are saying would happen and if they would cut the amount, but in California we go to war over water and the more and more it is going to be worth, the more scarce it is, the more big money is going to be having their say, not the people of California.</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.</p>
473	1	<p>First of all, let's look at the name. It is called a conservation plan, but it is not a conservation plan.</p> <p>Now, there is a strong history in California of calling things conservation plans when you want to damage the environment, so if you are going to do a big water project, concrete heavy, divert a lot of water and you're going to damage the environment, the first thing you do is call it a conservation plan because let's face it, most of us, we never get past the titles of things.</p>	<p>This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach. A modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. For detailed responses on the primary issues being raised with regard to the BDCP or Alternative 4, as well as a discussion of the current status of the draft BDCP Effects Analysis, please see Master Response 5.</p>
473	2	<p>The co-equal goals of improving the Delta and providing reliable water sources for Southern California are no longer being treated as co-equal. Shipping the water is getting preference over the environment. There are some parts of the plan that will solve some environmental problems. For example, there is a problem currently that the Tracy pumping stations cause reverse flows in the Delta, which confuses fish and makes it difficult for them to migrate to their natal streams and so forth.</p> <p>One proposal will fix that little problem, but that is like putting a band-aid on a little wound and then slitting your jugular because what is really going on here is we are diverting more water out of the Delta. The Delta is in trouble for a lot of reasons, but the primary reason is lack of water. You cannot fix lack of water by decreasing more water and increasing diversions.</p>	<p>BDCP Chapter 3 details the many ways in which BDCP will contribute to the conservation of fish and wildlife habitat in the Delta. As noted, addressing reverse flow problems in the south Delta is one of those contributions, but that is a minor part of one of the 21 different conservation measures detailed in BDCP Section 3.4. The many and varied benefits of those conservation measures are sorted and quantified in BDCP Chapter 5.</p>
473	3	<p>To where are we diverting water? To Kern County and other agricultural areas where farmers are planting permanent crops in the desert. This is not sustainable farming. Those areas do not have good drainage.</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 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>The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the proposed project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on water demand management, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.</p>
473	4	There were problems in the '70s with selenium building up in those same areas we intend to ship water to. When that selenium was then shipped north to get rid of it, we ended up causing the environmental damage in Kesterson National Wildlife Refuge.	<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>As described in the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS Chapter 8, Section 8.2.3.15, selenium criteria were promulgated by the State Water Resources Control Board and San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board for all of San Francisco Bay and the portions of the Delta waters in North San Francisco Bay, including portions of the Delta, and Suisun Bay, Carquinez Strait, San Pablo Bay, and the Central San Francisco Bay. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Action Plan for Water Quality Challenges in the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Estuary requires development of a new site-specific numeric selenium criteria to protect aquatic and terrestrial species dependent on the aquatic habitats of the Bay Delta Estuary. The new criteria being developed by the State Water Resources Control Board and San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board could be more stringent than the existing selenium water quality criteria and require actions that would decrease allowable concentrations of selenium in surface waters of the Bay Delta Estuary and may set allowable levels of selenium in the tissue of fish and wildlife.</p> <p>Applicable selenium objectives for water in the affected environment are summarized in Table 8-54, and selected benchmarks for assessment of selenium in whole-body fish, bird eggs, and fish fillets are presented in Table 8-55 in Appendix A Chapter 8 Water Quality of the RDEIR/SDEIS</p> <p>For more information regarding updated selenium analysis please see Section 8.3.1.7 Constituent-Specific Considerations Use in the Assessment in Appendix A Chapter 8 of the RDEIR/SDEIS</p> <p>For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.</p>
473	5	You cannot continue to farm in those desert areas without good drainage. It is not going to last. We here in the Delta area, we have good drainage. We have a strong agricultural economy. We can continue to farm here safely because we have good drainage. It makes no sense to ship water south to do unsustainable farming when it will further damage the Delta.	<p>The BDCP does not make determinations regarding how water conveyed through CM1, California Aqueduct, Delta Mendota Canal, or other water conveyance facilities is put to a beneficial use. Please see Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via BDCP proposed conveyance facilities.</p> <p>As a Habitat Conservation Plan and Natural Community Conservation Plan, the BDCP would protect, restore, and enhance the Delta ecosystem by adding water management flexibility, increased and improved habitat areas, and reduction of the effects of other stressors on covered species in the Delta. Although both the construction of new physical facilities in the Delta and the restoration of habitat will lead to the conversion of some amounts of agricultural land in the Delta, these effects will be subject to aggressive mitigation efforts. Land that is not directly affected by construction or habitat restoration should remain productive. Effects on farmland in the Delta, along with associated mitigation measures, are described in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, EIR/EIS. See Master Response 18 for more information regarding agricultural impact</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			mitigation.
473	6	We do not want to damage the Delta because this is not just a local issue. This is a planetary issue. The Delta is the nursery for the ocean. The entire Pacific Ocean depends on our Delta. This is the largest Delta on the west coast of the Americas both north and south. If we put the Delta over the tipping edge by further diversions of water, we are harming the entire ocean and the entire planet. Someday we are going to realize this and we will look back and say what were those people thinking.	Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California Water Fix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. The overall comment (i.e., that the BDCP is potentially a planetary issue) 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 California WaterFix Project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
474	1	Since this project has been in the works for some years, as evidenced by detailed maps, environmental studies, et cetera, displayed tonight, why has Governor Brown's plan never appeared on any ballot to assess voter's approval? Tax dollars should be spent if a majority of citizens agree with the Bay Delta Conservation Plan, not because politicians want it. I think it would have been better to take the temperature of the citizens whose tax dollars really are the base of all of the people who are here tonight, their studies and maps and everything else.	<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> <p>Even so, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>For more information on public outreach efforts, please see Master Response 40.</p>
475	1	<p>This is an obscene waste of state and federal taxpayers' money. The tunnels are nothing more than water theft. To steal water from San Joaquin County to pay for golf courses, swimming pools, green lawns, and large agribusiness is immoral and should be stopped.</p> <p>This project is way over budget and is nothing but big money Los Angeles paying our governor's Democratic campaign treasury to support it. It is outright theft and the governor should be ashamed.</p>	<p>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 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 26 (Changes in Delta Exports). 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), Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply), and Master Response 6 (Demand Management).</p> <p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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 43 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via California WaterFix proposed conveyance facilities.</p> <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 38 and Master Response 39 for more information on costs and funding.</p>
476	1	I thought this was in particular a meeting or an explanation of the tunnels plan. It appears to just be something of a Bay Conservation Plan and Bay Delta Conservation Plan, so I was a little bit misinformed as to what it actually is. And I have not had a chance to really read all of the information that I have received here.	<p>Please refer to Master Responses 42 and 41 for information related to outreach, transparency of the planning process and stakeholder engagement.</p> <p>The “tunnels plan” mentioned in the comment is part of the BDCP and described as Conservation Measure 1. However, 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>
476	2	I do have serious problems with the twin tunnels plan as to the effect of what I have read about them. I do not find that the mitigation plans will adequately address the problems or ensure the kind of water supply that the state needs.	<p>Under CEQA, feasible mitigation measures are required that could substantially lessen or minimize significant impacts. Mitigation measures are not required for effects which are not determined to be significant. For significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided, the EIR/EIS describes these in individual resource areas. Under CEQA, an agency may not approve a project with significant environmental impacts if there are feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen those impacts. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081, subd. (a); CEQA Guidelines, § 15092, subd. (b); see Santa Clarita Organization for Planning the Environment v. City of Santa Clarita (2011) 197 Cal.App.4th 1042, 1052-1053.) Thus, for every significant impact identified in an EIR, the agency must adopt all feasible mitigation measures that would substantially reduce the impact. Even with all feasible mitigation, however, the level of some impacts may still be higher than the threshold of significance identified in the EIR. For more information regarding Environmental Commitments please see Appendix 3B of the FEIR/EIS. Mitigation measures for each resource area are included in each of the individual chapters of the FEIR/EIS.</p> <p>It is important to note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California’s water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage.</p>
476	3	<p>I would like to see the state work particularly towards increasing the water availability for residents of the state from other sources such as desalination and purification of existing groundwater as well as possibly developing new sources of water from the other areas as they have developed the sources of electricity from other areas, other necessary things.</p> <p>I would like to see much more emphasis put on that development of new resources.</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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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>
476	4	I think that one thing that has not adequately been addressed is the cost of trying to do all of these mitigation measures as well as actually constructing the tunnels and moving the water through them, and there has not been adequate consideration of the human cost to those of us who live in and around the Delta.	Where significant environmental impacts have been identified in the EIR/EIS, mitigation measures have been proposed to avoid and/or minimize these effects. The parties responsible for funding the implementation of these measures would depend on the activity for which the measure is required. As described in Chapter 8, Implementation Costs and Funding Sources, Table 8-41, BDCP, entities receiving water from BDCP facilities would pay for 65.2% of the total cost of mitigation measures identified in the EIR/EIS. The balance would be funded by other state or federal funding sources, as further described in Chapter 8. Additional detail regarding the timing and logistics for the implementation of these measures can be found in the Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program.
477	1	I'm very much against the tunnels. I think it will affect the quality of life in Stockton. I was born and raised in Stockton and teach in Stockton.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
477	2	<p>The tunnel plan could crowd out a locally controlled conservation program. Water tables are at unrecoverable levels right now.</p> <p>Two-thirds of the flow of the Sacramento River would be diverted south of the Delta.</p>	<p>The No Action Alternative and all of the alternatives in the EIR/EIS assume continued use of groundwater, water from the Calaveras River (by Stockton East Water District), CVP water from the Stanislaus River (by Stockton East Water District), and water from the Delta (by City of Stockton).</p> <p>As described in Section 3.4.1.2 of Chapter 3, Development of Alternatives, the north Delta intake diversion rules in December through June would not allow major diversions to begin until the Sacramento River flow was greater than a specified threshold in all alternatives in the EIR/EIS (generally 5,000 cfs). These bypass rules control how much of the Delta exports are diverted from the north Delta intakes to protect water supplies and water quality for Delta water users and Delta habitat conditions.</p>
477	3	I and my family are concerned about having construction traffic, increased air pollution, lowering of groundwater quality, increased salt water intrusion, loss of thousands of acres of farmland and our natural waterway would become an eyesore. This would change our way of life here. Stockton has been through a lot and to me this is just one last awful thing to happen here.	Chapter 19, Transportation, Chapter 22, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Chapter 7, Groundwater, Chapter 8, Water Quality, Chapter 14, Agriculture, and Chapter 17, Aesthetic and Visual Resources, describe potential impacts from the project respectively. Where significant environmental impacts have been identified related to these issues, mitigation measures have been proposed to avoid, reduce, and minimize those impacts to the extent feasible.
477	4	I took a tour of our water treatment plant last year and a group of us at the end asked about how will these tunnels affect our water and they told us, they didn't want to, they said that if we were you we wouldn't want to be living here when this changed over with the tunnels going through. It's going to affect the water quality that much.	RDEIR/SDEIS Section 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.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
478	1	We have yet to be told how and who will control the adjustments that we understand can be made in the future to the flow charts or flow criteria. For example, the 6400 cfs on diversion, amount could be adjusted up or down. By who and under what circumstances?	<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 about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p> <p>Considerable scientific uncertainty exists regarding the Delta ecosystem, including the effects of CVP and SWP operations and the related operational criteria. To address this uncertainty, DWR, Reclamation, DFW, USFWS, NMFS, and the public water agencies will establish a robust program of collaborative science, monitoring, and adaptive management. It is assumed the Collaborative Science and Adaptive Management Program (AMMP) developed for Alternative 4A would not, by itself, create nor contribute to any new significant environmental effects; instead, the AMMP would influence the operation and management of facilities and protected or restored habitat associated with Alternative 4A.</p> <p>Collaborative science and adaptive management will support the proposed action by helping to address scientific uncertainty where it exists, and as it relates to the benefits and impacts of the construction and operations of the new water conveyance facility and existing CVP and SWP facilities.</p> <p>The collaborative science effort is expected to inform operational decisions within the ranges established by the biological opinion and 2081b permit for the proposed action. However, if new science suggests that operational changes may be appropriate that fall outside of the operational ranges evaluated in the biological opinion and authorized by the 2081b permit, the appropriate agencies will determine, within their respective authorities, whether those changes should be implemented. An analysis of the biological effects of any such changes will be conducted to determine if those effects fall within the range of effects analyzed and authorized under the biological opinion and 2081b permit. If NMFS, USFWS, or DFW determine that impacts to listed species are greater than those analyzed and authorized under the biological opinion and 2081b 41 Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix permit, consultation may need to be reinitiated and/or the permittees may need to seek a 2081b permit amendment. Likewise, if an analysis shows that impacts to water supply are greater than those analyzed in the EIR/EIS, it may be necessary to complete</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>additional environmental review to comply with CEQA or NEPA.</p> <p>For more information regarding adaptive management please see Master Response 33.</p>
478	2	Owens Valley is a good example of how a lake can be drained and die even though the experts claim they have put in place controls that would never allow this to happen.	<p>The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor include any regulatory actions that would affect water rights holders other than DWR, Reclamation, and SWP and CVP contractors.</p> <p>Importantly, all water exported by the SWP and CVP is subject to the existing water rights of those two agencies. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives analyzed in the EIR/EIS only include the use of water from existing SWP and CVP water rights or voluntary water transfers from other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders.</p> <p>The proposed project's facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants, would be operated in accordance with permits issued by, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the State Water Resources Control Board, among other agencies. The proposed project would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>Through the Legislature and through executive agencies, California has embraced water conservation on numerous fronts, as have many California water agencies. Many of these efforts are highlighted in Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, which describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply, including recycled water. While these elements are not proposed as part of the project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. It is important to note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage.</p> <p>For more information regarding alternatives development, water demand management, and purpose and need please see Master Response 4, Master Response 6, and Master Response 3.</p> <p>The Proposed Project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the Proposed Project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p>
478	3	<p>A possible solution that would be workable for all is desalination. With its price going down (while the tunnel price increases from 25 billion to its present 60 billion to whatever it might be when constructed) desalination could be quite well funded with this amount of capital. Please comment.</p> <p>Number 4B, desalination would allow the farmers in the Central Valley to receive all the</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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		water they need (not want) from the existing Delta flow! At the same time desalination would allow Southern California to receive the water they need. This would be a win-win as the entire state would be being paying for the desalination. Please comment.	<p>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 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>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>
479	1	Have you ever been down on I-5 that used to be the west side Highway 33, past the hills on the southeast side of Tracy? That is grazing country. That is all it is good for. Then further south they put in all these water intensive crops. They have got two canals running down there already. Why do we need to take water out of the river and send more down south? It is all going to end up in Los Angeles anyway.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental impact analysis provided in the EIR/EIS documentation.
479	2	The more they bypass the Delta, it is bad for the fish. It will cause the Bay water to creep up eastward into the Delta where the farmers pump water for their crops and now they will be pumping salty water onto their crops.	Discussion of the main environmental attributes affecting individual covered species is 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,

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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 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> <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>
479	3	I think the only reason this is happening is because of the political pull of Los Angeles where they have most all of the legislators because of the size of the area down there.	<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 to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <p>Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, 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>
480	1	I am against the tunnels because of the impact on the farming communities of the north and south Delta area.	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. For information on impacts to Delta communities, see Master Response 24.
480	2	I am concerned about the salinization of the water that will be coming into the Delta from the Bay. I am concerned about the impact that this project will have on the San Francisco Bay Area also.	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 agricultural and fish and wildlife 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. Finally, a new Impact WQ-34 has been added to water quality assessment in Chapter 8 for all alternatives to discuss impacts to San Francisco Bay in the Final EIR/EIS.
480	3	I am concerned about the impact of the traffic, of the construction and of the disruption, on migration birds.	<p>Discussion of the main environmental attributes affecting individual covered species is 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 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>
480	4	I am definitely against this tunnel. I am against the peripheral canal and I am for desalination plans in Southern California. I am totally against West County down in Bakersfield taking our water for irrigating their almonds.	<p>The Lead Agencies acknowledge your opposition to the BDCP.</p> <p>Master Response 36 discusses how the proposed BDCP has been refined and improved since the proposed "peripheral canal."</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.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>other sources of water supply, including desalination. Also, as described in Appendix 3A, Section 3A.7, Results of Initial Screening of Conveyance Alternatives, EIR/EIS, 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. Although BDCP does not include desalination as an alternative, it also does not preclude desalination as a means to help meet California's water supply needs. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the development of alternatives, and Master Response 7 for further information regarding desalination.</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 BDCP proposed conveyance facilities. Contractors and their customers must make economic decisions about planting in light of the amounts of water they are likely to receive going forward.</p>
481	1	<p>This whole BDC Plan, it is the same as it has always been. They are bypassing all of us who live here in the Delta. They are not taking into consideration any of us who live here in the Delta and we are going to be paying the brunt of this project. We have no representation on any of the big boards in Sacramento.</p> <p>We can only come to these meetings and voice our little opinions that either go on deaf ears or goes nowhere.</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response 5 for information pertaining to funding of the current proposed project.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 32 in the 2013 EIR/EIS and 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>
481	2	<p>The fish in the Delta by the diversion of water, they have decimated the fish population. And with the new diversion of water out of the Sacramento River it is going to further impact the Delta fish population, the habitat and any restoration they may be planning. It is not going to work.</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 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>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>
481	3	<p>The salt intrusion into our area that is not there now, a little bit in the summer, it will be our everyday life.</p> <p>The water quality in our part of the Delta, I live on Bethel Island, which is point ground zero to this whole project, will be everybody to the north of us and our area directly around us will be highly impacted by the salt intrusion coming into us. It will be however many cubic feet a second they plan on pulling out of Sacramento will not be coming through the entire</p>	<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 Impacts WQ-7 (chloride) and WQ-11 (EC) in Chapter 8, Water Quality. Where significant impacts to agricultural and fish and wildlife 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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		system of the Delta so the salt intrusion will be far worse than it is now.	than significant impacts on salinity-related parameters.
481	4	The invasive species that are in our part of the Delta now will continue to be a problem and right now there's no way to address it and we do not deal with anything being addressed in the future.	The prevalence of non-native species in the Delta is described in BDCP Section 2.3.4, where each natural community description contains a subsection describing the prevalence and ecological consequences of non-native species in that natural community. The proposed project will incorporate existing Conservation Measures from the BDCP as Environmental Commitments (ECs) to further address the issue of non-native species (RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix 3B Section 3B.5). EC 11 Natural Communities Enhancement and Management describes how non-native vegetation will be disturbed or removed. Restoration ECs may have non-native weed control through operation and maintenance of restored sites (EC 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10). EC 15, Localized Reduction of Predatory Fish, does not intend to entirely remove non-native predators at the north and south Delta export facilities. It is intended to reduce localized abundance of fish predators of salmonids at these two locations through active capture methods. Division of Boating and Waterways' Aquatic Weed Control Program helps suppress and control Water Hyacinth and Egeria densa.
481	5	The spoils of this tunnel, if they do plan on building a tunnel, the spoils from this dredging, drilling, however they are going to do it, is going to be in our neighborhood, in our backyard for a long period of time.	<p>The commenter is referred to Section 3B.1.19.4. Material Reuse Plans in Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, EIR/EIS, which describes the ways in which Reusable Tunnel Material (i.e., tunnel muck) and other earthen materials could be used and therefore the general types of locations to which the material could be taken.</p> <p>Specific locations at which Reusable Tunnel Material would be used for restoration, flood control improvements, or other beneficial use have not been determined are presently unknown. Use of the material and therefore the types of locations to which it would be taken would follow the guidelines described in Table 3C-7. Borrow, Spoils and Reusable Tunnel Material Storage in Appendix 3C, Construction Assumptions for Water Conveyance Facilities, EIR/EIS. In order to assess impacts, the draft EIR/EIS analysis assumes RTM would be permanently placed at the locations shown in Mapbook Figures M3-1 through M3-4 or hauled to disposal sites, although future projects could reuse RTM for levee and construction site fill and potentially for fill in restoration sites proposed under the project. Until the material is extracted and analyzed the appropriate use and location cannot be determined.</p> <p>Decisions about where, within the project area, RTM might be used will only be made after additional environmental analysis is completed and additional public input is sought and obtained. For additional information, please see Master Response 12 regarding reusable tunnel material.</p>
481	6	<p>The two gate project in Discovery Bay is still in the mix for them to divert the water exactly where they wanted it to go and how they wanted it to go. That part of the project is still in place by the maps we saw today. Everything is still in place. There is a possibility of being in an above ground canal, in the Knightsen area all the way down to the forebay, that is not there now; highly impacting our whole area. And we have it in our backyard to send water to Southern California.</p> <p>This is the water grab no matter how you look at it, no matter how, which way you want to put it. It is all about diversion of water and how much that water is worth. The fish is just a byproduct. The environment is just a byproduct.</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 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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Wildlife and NMFS fish screen criteria (BDCP Appendix 5B Section 3.B.3.3).</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>Although Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A include only those habitat restoration measures needed to provide mitigation for specific regulatory compliance purposes, habitat restoration is still recognized as a critical component of the state's long-term plans for the Delta. Such larger endeavors, however, will likely be implemented over time under actions separate and apart from these alternatives. The primary parallel habitat restoration program is called California EcoRestore (EcoRestore), which will be overseen by the California Resources Agency and implemented under the California Water Action Plan. 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> <p>The Proposed Project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the Proposed Project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.</p>
481	7	The BDCP plan will save the day, it is all the same group, the same amount of people, the same amount of everything is all the same, just change the name so new people can get involved. Everything is the same, other than we are going to get hit. It is going to probably happen at some point in time.	<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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <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>
481	8	I hope we can stop it by any means possible because this is going to be impacting an entire Delta system, there is only one other one in the world and it's in China and that river system in China puts more pollution into the ocean than any other system in the world, we will be number two.	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.
482	1	I am 110 percent opposed to Governor Brown's plan for twin tunnels. We need every drop of that water to flush and fill the Delta and to preserve and enlarge the fish count. Bay Delta Conservation Plan is a misnomer. A more apt naming would be the Bay Delta Grade Plan. We need that water here in Northern California and I am strongly opposed to the theft of our water.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state ESAs; as such, it 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 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. Also, refer to Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
482	2	I am opposed. I think it is extremely costly. This is not the time to do it. We need to explore other options. I am not supportive of this plan.	<p>The proposed project is costly, but the lead agencies have assessed the benefits as described in the BDCP funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those facilities. Expenditures of public money from other sources would be limited to restoration activities beyond those needed to mitigate the impacts of facility construction. BDCP Chapter 8, which deals with cost issues, and cost-benefit analysis information are available on the BDCP website. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on project costs and funding.</p> <p>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.</p>
483	1	<p>My concern is more looking at what's happening in the communities that are going to be impacted. I look at a place like Washington, Illinois, where my husband's from. A tornado devastated that town, people lost homes before Thanksgiving and the holidays. There was something to rally around. His 50th year graduating class and all the other groups banded together and were able to help the community and help it come back together again.</p> <p>The communities that are going to be impacted by this have nothing like that. Families are going to be destroyed. Homes and lands are going to be, altered to such a point that they are not the same that they were for the years that people have had them in the families and all. There is nothing to rally around. There is nothing we can do to help them. I think</p>	<p>Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the BDCP would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California.</p> <p>When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the proposed project. Construction of water conveyance facilities would be sequenced over approximately 10 years. Construction of individual components (e.g. intakes, tunnels) would range from one to six years. Temporary construction-related impacts include noise, visual, and transportation, among others. The construction-related impacts are disclosed in individual resource area chapters in the Draft BDCP</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		that is going to be an egregious comment or statement of how we are willing to treat our residents and our citizens.	<p>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>
484	1	I think we need to increase California's capacity to store water both above and below ground. San Joaquin County in particular has lost almost a hundred feet of groundwater space and the ground has collapsed. It is an ongoing issue.	<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>For more information regarding water storage please see Master Response 37.</p>
484	2	I believe that we need to restrict the crop use from the existing water aqueduct system as many farmers down south are excessively using the water from the current system taken from our dwindling water supply here in Northern California. To that point, years ago there was no farming down in some parts of Southern California. They have taken the water from here so they can farm down there, which has also financially impacted the farmers in this region.	<p>The State Water Resources Control Board, not DWR, is responsible for decisions relating to water rights. DWR holds water rights approved by the State Water Resources Control Board but does not have the power or authority to issue water rights to others. Additionally, the proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor include any regulatory actions that would affect water rights holders other than DWR, Reclamation, and SWP and CVP contractors.</p> <p>Importantly, all water exported by the SWP and CVP is the subject of the existing water rights of those two agencies. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives analyzed in the EIR/EIS only include the use of water from existing SWP and CVP water rights or voluntary water transfers from other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders.</p>
484	3	We need to reclaim and reuse waste water. We can adapt proven conservative measures as used in Las Vegas as an example. If you go to a website with the initials www.lvcwe.com and review these successful measures taken, they have cut the water supply 30 percent per individual in Las Vegas in the last several years reaching very attainable goals.	<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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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>
484	4	Import water and other ideas to import water from the northwest. We have an abundance of unused rainwater. Build a pipeline from Washington, Oregon, down to Lake Shasta and filter it down to a system from there versus taking it from already blighted areas.	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.
484	5	Desalination water treatment for coastal cities should be mandatory as a lot of these cities that are on the coast live in desert basins right on the ocean. There is an ample water supply right there with desalination. In Los Angeles in particular a great location for that would be right next to LAX in the land between Playa Del Rey and Manhattan Beach. There's an open stretch right on the water capable for desalination.	<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. Please see Master Response 7 regarding desalination.</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>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
484	6	I believe down in Southern California, having been a resident and lived down there, when the storms come through and there is torrential rains that water runs right down into the ocean. I believe they should capture, filter and use the rainwater that floods Southern California during the wet winter periods.	<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>
484	7	Since Southern California is a desert basin, if people live in this location, water should be used responsibly with penalty if wasted and their water should cost more to offset the expenses the rest of California has to bear with their lifestyle choice.	<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 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>
484	8	To the point of what is happening in our Delta that a lot of people may be unaware, but our ecosystem is already in blight. We have got foreign plant species that are choking the water supply here. We have got plant life growing from the ground up that is never been there before. We have got species that have invaded the water, cutting back water use	The prevalence of non-native species in the Delta is described in BDCP Section 2.3.4, where each natural community description contains a subsection describing the prevalence and ecological consequences of non-native species in that natural community. The proposed project will incorporate existing Conservation Measures from the BDCP as Environmental Commitments (ECs) to further address the issue of non-native species (RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix 3B Section 3B.5). EC 11 Natural Communities Enhancement and

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		and deeply damaged the ecosystem in this area.	Management describes how non-native vegetation will be disturbed or removed. Restoration ECs may have non-native weed control through operation and maintenance of restored sites (EC 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10). EC 15, Localized Reduction of Predatory Fish, does not intend to entirely remove non-native predators at the north and south Delta export facilities. It is intended to reduce localized abundance of fish predators of salmonids at these two locations through active capture methods. Division of Boating and Waterways' Aquatic Weed Control Program helps suppress and control Water Hyacinth and Egeria densa.
484	9	My opinion is it does not make any sense to take healthy water from an already strained water system ecosystem and bring it to another area when you have viable alternative sources.	Since 2006, the project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. Fifteen alternatives and 3 sub-alternatives were analyzed in the Draft EIR/EIS and the RDEIR/SDEIS, respectively. Other proposals by public and private individuals and organizations have also been evaluated and described in Chapter 3 of the Draft EIR/S and Appendix 3A of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Also, see Master Response 4 (Alternatives).
485	1	<p>I am adamantly against this project, the BDCP, primarily because of dollars. The state is already in a lot of debt. The governor is talking about trying to take current state general funds to pay down the debt and up until the last year or so we were looking at cutting all kinds of things, including courts and everything else that still are not back to full funding.</p> <p>The prison situation is really bad because of dollars. They have cut Medicaid and other community programs, and it is ludicrous in the context of cutting all these services to then want to go into debt in billions of dollars. The cost is already escalated from initial estimates, almost a third to 50 percent more now than it was then, and it is expected to probably balloon even further in the umpteenth years it is going to take to complete the project.</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. Funding for habitat restoration will come from a variety of sources, including the participating state and federal water contractors (as mitigation for the impacts associated with the construction of water conveyance facilities), federal appropriations, state and federal grants, and the water bond. Funding sources for the BDCP are further described in Chapter 8, Implementation Costs and Funding Sources, BDCP. Please see Master Response 5 regarding costs of implementation and funding for the proposed project.
485	2	The water is not there. We are in the midst of a dry drought year. There are other dry drought years. The climate changing scientists are forecasting possibly more severe shortages and droughts and calamities in the environment.	<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 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>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<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, restoration, and enhancement of the Delta ecosystem and measures to reduce other stressors (Environmental Commitments 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, and 16). In addition to the added water management flexibility created by new water diversions and operational scenarios, California Waterfix would improve habitat, increase food supplies and reduce the effects of other stressors on the Delta ecosystem. By improving and expanding available habitat, the proposed project would increase resilience and adaptability to climate change by making alternative habitat available during periods of high stress, such as very high or low freshwater inflow or very high salinity intrusion.</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 adaptability of the Delta to climate change can be found in Chapter 29, Climate Change, EIR/EIS and Appendix A RDEIR/SDEIS and Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS (in appendix A).</p>
485	3	It is foolhardy to consider going this much into debt, dollarwise, for water that really is not there to begin with or will not be there as a dependable source.	<p>The Proposed Project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the Proposed Project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p> <p>For more information regarding funding of the proposed project please see Master Response 5.</p>
485	4	I just wonder if the dollars spent on this project could be invested in water desalination and come up with a little bit more cost effective and reliable water source. Other than the Westlands Water District, I question what the percentage of water delivered goes to the San Diego and Los Angeles County water districts in their own water district as opposed to inland water districts like Westland and other San Joaquin Valley agricultural interests. So if we eliminate the latter deliveries, then the coastal deliveries in San Diego and Los Angeles might be better delivered water desalination.	<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 they required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project. Issues related to desalination include land use impacts, costs, and substantial energy use requirements. Advances in technology have improved feasibility of desalination and as a statewide water use planning component, it will be evaluated by water agencies on a local/regional level. Please see Master Response 7 for further information regarding desalination. For more information regarding cost and funding sources please see Master Response 5, respectively.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
485	5	I sincerely hope that the governmental process that is behind the BDCP has not committed itself to something that they are just window dressing this event with. I hope that the public gets a chance to vote on this project and not any backroom politicians' yea or nay without public commitment.	<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> <p>Even so, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>For more information on public outreach efforts, please see Master Response 40.</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>
486	1	First is a California desalination to Bakersfield basin, not at the North Delta destruction of Sacramento, North San Joaquin Delta area livelihoods, such as salt backup amidst tunnel talk.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 7, which describes why an alternative focused on desalination is not included in the EIR/EIS. Desalination is one strategy used in California to develop new supplies, yet it is not the primary solution for the State's water shortage due to many factors, including limited capacity and technology, high costs and energy demands, and regulatory uncertainty.
486	2	For representation in economic impact of North San Joaquin County water engineers, growers of California are first in agriculture across the USA and other countries. Note: Lodi vineyards are only 24 miles from Rio Vista, part of the Delta protected sturgeon, cranes, marinists and historic communities.	Please see Chapter 16 regarding Socioeconomic impacts. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
486	3	Goal for archive references, Californians statewide already voted against this.	Please see response to Comment 486-13.
486	4	Thank you for the free press, the open docket meeting, open meeting documents, email	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		alerts, et cetera.	the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
486	5	<p>Born and raised in Lodi, California, USA, fifth generation mother's side. I asked her what was it like around the grapevine before? Well, tule elk, but mostly sagebrush. My father's family came from Kansas and my grandfather picked out the very fertile soil, some of the most fertile in the world for grape crops.</p> <p>I am an alum of UC Berkeley, BA in classics and also Davis. I often made the panoramic hour drive to East Bay. Our family went on poker ski runs on the Delta. I helped my late father in grafting the vineyards and he said there was increased salt in the soil.</p> <p>This is my critique submitted to delay and stop tunnel drafting.</p>	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
486	6	Sanfranciscobaydeltaconservationplan.com. The glossary did not include desalination and an index would help. Now I learn it was at the bottom at the far end, so maybe a table of contents would help for those of us to be able to target and analyze and respond for you.	The Draft EIR/EIS included a glossary, table of contents and an index. Desalination is not included in the glossary because the document does not evaluate desalination as one of or a component of any of the alternatives. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed and Master Response 7 regarding desalination.
486	7	Pacific desalination. What research application can be done for Bakersfield basin, not Delta destruction of Sacramento-North San Joaquin livelihoods? What is the future legacy of reknown California universities research on desalination like in Australia and Kuwait? Desalination is known and reserved for California coast counties where I live, Huntington Beach and Ventura County cities.	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>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>
486	8	California representation. What about concerns from North San Joaquin County growers, fishermen, for prehistoric sturgeons, not to mention salmon, cranes and wetlands, taxpayers?	<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 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> <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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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 public outreach efforts please see Master Response 40.</p> <p>For more information regarding cost of the proposed project please see Master Response 5.</p>
486	9	bdcpc.com has new map flaws I learned at supervisor meetings of Advisory Water Commission that San Joaquin -- it was the sjgov.org 2014.1.	This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, State and Federal agencies decided to change the approach. A modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) is being considered. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. For detailed responses on the primary issues being raised with regard to the BDCP or Alternative 4, as well as a discussion of the current status of the draft BDCP Effects Analysis, please see Master Response 5.
486	10	Financial estimates/analysis. Where is reconfiguration of larger impact of needless economic crisis to the locals, growers, marine owners, citizens and taxpayers statewide? That is for over 30 to 50 years. For instance, in Lodi it's a five billion dollar wine grape impact on the local economy. Again, my references are cited in the written submission, but it is, lodidistrictgrapegrowers.org research.	<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>
486	11	Air pollution and losses would occur from minimum 10 years of pounding, literal mud slinging, loss of green crops for good air, et cetera. How much subsequent loss of air quality would impact less healthy air to health costs and burdens on all region citizens? For instance, Lodi is not on the map for BDCP as I saw and we are only 24 miles away. So we are impacted. Yet they are asking people down in San Diego, I do not know why, to learn about their tunnels down there.	The 2013 Draft EIR/EIS Chapter 22, Appendix A Chapter 22 (Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases), and RDEIR/SDEIS Section 4.3.18 evaluate criteria pollutant emissions associated with the construction of each alternative. The proposed project would be implemented in a manner intended to minimize the potential for adverse health effects, such as those mentioned. There are numerous mitigation measures intended to reduce air quality effects to as low a level as possible. As described in Section 22.2.1.1, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has established de minimis thresholds to define levels at which pollutants would not impede a region's ability to achieve air pollution goals outlined in their State Implementation Plan (SIP). Construction of the proposed project would exceed the applicable de minimis threshold for nitrogen oxides (NOX). The project will fully offset construction-related NOX emissions to net zero through implementation of Mitigation Measures identified in the EIR/EIS. With respect to human health impacts; the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases Chapters and Sections identified above include a health risk assessment (HRA) evaluating health impacts to all sensitive receptors, which include residences, schools,

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			hospitals, places of worship, daycare facilities, parks, or any other facilities where people are susceptible to air pollutants. In addition, as potential impacts to human health are construction-related, construction emissions and exposure of sensitive receptors to construction-related emissions will cease once construction activities have ended.
486	12	US Army Corps of Engineers. The Corps gave over 50 reports on saving San Joaquin, Sacramento, North San Joaquin Delta levees, high maintenance and/or private dredging for Rio Vista. This was in the Lodi News Sentinel 2013.2, that is February. How are California Delta levee funds sent to Washington state instead? (SACBEE.COM 2013.) I might add that the Corps of Engineers helps avoid flooding, too, by their maintenance, timely maintenance.	The comment discusses USACE reports and flood protection responsibilities. It does not raise any environmental issue related to the EIR/EIS.
486	13	Investigation of alleged corruption. What are patterns in government contracting, escalating costs by water bonds to taxpayers and stock grower profits? California voters against Peripheral Canals was ignored. I have to double check the date. May have been 1980s or 1990s. Now the transfer is to a committee that disclodes (sic) locals of North San Joaquin County water engineers, growers. For instance, I met a Kory Kuykendall, 30-year water engineer with North San Joaquin County and he is not being consulted. He is in Lodi. Why do elected officials call for infrastructure and job creation by contracting appointments? That is sacbee.com yesterday in 2014 1.20 page A-1 front page, other public references are online.	A number of important improvements have been made to set the current proposal apart from the Peripheral Canal. For instance, tunnels are proposed to reduce surface impacts associated with canals. The capacity of the Proposed Project is more than 10,000 cfs smaller than the Peripheral Canal. The project as proposed allows for dual conveyance allowing through-Delta operations to continue in order to maintain in-Delta water quality. The Proposed Project would require operation of the proposed new in-Delta portions of the CVP and SWP pursuant to environmentally stringent rules under the Federal Endangered Species Act and California Endangered Species Act. 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.
486	14	Protection of dams, like Shasta Dam, my next-door neighbor's husband was instrumental in helping the wine grape business marketing as was his cousin. She said the Shasta Dam is very important to the Lodi area and we hear of water moved with reservoirs. There was something in yesterday's Sacramento Bee with I think Folsom Dam, Auburn Dam. They were taking out so much water and now they can only take out so much. I wonder if regulations are being followed. I am going to attempt not to ad lib. For economic and agribusiness concern, growers require Sierra water and treatment with regulations. Delta soils show increased salt in soil and threat of salt backup.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
486	15	Restore Delta beauty. Have drafters driven California's Scenic and historic Highway 165, Sacramento, North San Joaquin Delta? Amidst the panoramic Mt. Diablo sunsets many crops are grown: Pears, asparagus, olives, walnuts, berries, grapes. Restorethedelta.org gives us	Please refer to EIR Chapter 17, Section 17.3.1 Methods for Analysis, which discusses direct field observations conducted in January 2012 and July 2013. In addition, please refer to Appendix 17A, which contains locational data for the candidate key observation points (KOPs) and Figure 17D-1 that maps the locations

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		news digest.	surveyed. Note that these points were accessed via roadways throughout the study area.
486	16	Stoppage or injunction. This literal cover-up has premature tunnel costs. 2013 news varies as 14 billion to then 67 billion in plans. (SACBEE.COM.) Why destroy by a tunnel along the natural Delta river estuary?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such 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.
486	17	Notations of common sense. How timely would be reconsideration on the worst California drought in its history which the governor has acknowledged?	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analyses provided in the EIR/EIS documentation.
486	18	California archives. The internet has information on global agendas to tax water and air space since 1992. Californians and the state warrant ownership. However, 19 easements obtained by a Virginia company major conservancy again paying 22 million dollars for land. Owens Valley Alps likewise was declined to dust for LA water. Hetch Hetchy dam, Yosemite, was added after the 1906 San Francisco earthquake, which by the way did not affect areas of the part of the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS or the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS.
486	19	Humans migrate from cities to towns for water. Who are profiteers? Both water privateers and bureaucracy, public paper laundering, reference Roman history. People can move to the water, not vice versa.	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.
486	20	With requested actions for North San Joaquin Delta communities, first, the desalination of Bakersfield basin, not Delta destruction by tunnels, travesty, along North San Joaquin Delta communities. And second, for livelihoods with representation of North San Joaquin County growers of crops, California is number one in agriculture USA and certainly the largest western America Delta is significant in that. It is a representation as well for the protected wildlife, sturgeons and cranes, marinas, for family recreation, fisherman, et cetera, and historic communities to be represented like the grand mansion where my niece had a wedding near Walnut Grove and Lodi crops.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
486	21	Thank you for again for the free press, the open meeting documentation. We just ask that none of these points be simply dismissed by words, that the archives are indeed considered for California history and preservation and conservation, and the happiness of all involved.	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.
487	1	I am from Antioch, California, and in Antioch our water quality currently is fairly low. We are concerned about the effect that the project will have on our water quality. I was talking to some of the engineers inside and they were telling me that, particularly with respect to fluoride, our water quality might fall or probably will fall. I would like to make sure that something is done. They said there is always ways to mitigate, but I would like something to be done to mitigate that sort of effect on Antioch water supply.	Fluoride is generally found at low concentrations in surface water relative to applicable water quality thresholds for sensitive agricultural crops or drinking water concerns. Consequently, the effects of the proposed project operations, which would not change any source of fluoride in the environment, was not specifically assessed in the EIR/EIS. 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. Additionally, adding intakes in the North Delta will allow for operational flexibility that can improve natural

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			flow in the Delta and avoid impacts to migratory fish based on real time data and operations
487	2	It is a very expensive project that does not create any new sources of water, and it seems to me with the state spending \$24 billion, that we should look at things like recycling, water desalinization, other things which I know are expensive, but they would develop new water instead of trying to distribute water that we have already got.	<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>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>
488	1	We (Don Updegraff) own the Clarksburg Marina, and our concerns are regarding the quality of the fishery during construction and following construction, as well as recreational boating in the Clarksburg area. Our livelihood depends on our customers keeping their boats at our marina.	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.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
488	2	I am wondering if the project is going to adversely affect the environment that my boaters and fishermen come to my marina for.	<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>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 lead agencies will incorporate environmental commitments and best management practices (BMPs) into the action alternatives to avoid or minimize potential adverse effects (a NEPA term) and potential significant impacts (a CEQA term). The lead agencies 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.</p>
488	3	I am concerned about boating traffic, if there is going to be an effect in the area of my marina, and highway traffic along South River Road and River View Drive where my marina is located.	<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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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>Details on impacts to specific locations and marinas can be found in the introductory paragraph under each alternative in Chapter 15, Recreation, EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a would reduce impacts on marine navigation by development and implementation of site-specific construction traffic management plans, including specific measures related to management of barges and stipulations to notify the commercial and leisure boating communities of proposed barge operations in the waterways.</p> <p>Impacts on transportation, such as highways, can be found in Chapter 19, Transportation. For most alternatives, it is anticipated that most construction traffic would occur on Highway 160 on the eastern bank of the Sacramento River.</p>
488	4	I'm wondering if there are measures in place to compensate my marina if the project has detrimental effects to my marina's economy.	<p>Compensation measures are not included for indirect effects to individual businesses. Please see Master Response [Placeholder DMR 46] regarding economic compensation.</p> <p>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. Many of these details can be found in Impact REC-2 in Chapter 15, Recreation, EIR/EIS. Additionally, as described in Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, the project proponents will develop and implement a noise abatement plan.</p>
488	5	I am concerned about water levels under my marina. In the last three years we've seen an all-time low water level at the marina, and cannot physically withstand lower water levels than are currently being experienced.	<p>Operations of the conveyance facilities are not expected to result in a substantial decrease or increase in Delta surface water levels. See Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Modeling Results, EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS, for more information. Section C reports changes in the monthly averaged daily minimum elevation of the Sacramento River at Freeport (see Section C tables). Results for each alternative are presented by month, probability of exceedance, and by water year type. Results are also presented in comparison to Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative. The modeling results for the future No Action Alternative indicate that water levels may continue to change as climate change occurs within the Delta.</p> <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>
489	1	<p>I live in Clarksburg, California, and we own a farm here.</p> <p>The items that I would like for your consideration. As this project diminishes the farm</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

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		acreage in the Delta, it is going to reduce jobs, and it will reduce the number of people that live here and their children. And these schools are struggling down here now with enrollment, and this will exacerbate that problem.	<p>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> <p>It is assumed that the majority (approximately 70 percent) of construction workers would be drawn from the five Delta counties. Approximately 30 percent of construction workers are expected to come from outside of the Delta region. For more information, please see Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, Impact ECON-2, 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS, and Chapter 30, Section 30.3.2.1, Direct Growth Inducement, 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS. Additionally, the Job Creation & Protection Fact Sheet reports that 155,090 jobs will be created by the 2013 proposed BDCP (a full-time equivalent job is defined as one person working full-time for one year).</p> <p>Under the proposed project, increased water delivery reliability could result in beneficial impacts on minority or low income communities. These beneficial impacts could occur in areas where a large proportion of economic activity is dependent on agricultural production and in which the agricultural labor force is primarily composed of minority or low income workers. Increased water delivery reliability to San Joaquin Valley and Tulare Basin would result in stabilization of employment opportunities. Because agricultural-related employment within the San Joaquin Valley and Tulare Basin is predominantly composed of low income and minority workers, the increase in reliability of water deliveries could result in a beneficial effect on these worker's employment and income levels. 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>For more information regarding agricultural mitigation please see Master Response 18.</p>
489	2	As these areas are inundated with water, there's going to be a greater problem with the vector control and other water problems. I would expect an increase in the West Nile virus. We have had two cases in this area.	<p>Certain features of the proposed project (e.g., cofferdams at the intake sites, sedimentation basins, solids lagoons, and the intermediate forebay inundation area) have the potential to provide mosquito breeding habitat.</p> <p>The depth, design, and operation of the sedimentation basins and solids lagoons would prevent the development of suitable mosquito habitat primarily due to their depth (23 feet and 15 feet, respectively), and because the water contained in these structures would be constantly circulated and the flow rates would be high enough to prevent water from stagnating. Additionally, project proponents will consult with the appropriate mosquito vector control district(s) prior to construction of the intakes and before the</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>sedimentation basins, solids lagoons and the intermediate forebay inundation area become operational to inform mosquito management and control practices in order to limit public health risks from mosquito-borne diseases. Further, once the sedimentation basins, solids lagoons and intermediate forebay inundation area become operational, Project proponents will again consult with the mosquito vector control districts to determine if mosquitoes are present in these conveyance components. If mosquitos are present, mosquito control techniques will be implemented.</p> <p>To aid in vector management and control, the construction contractors will be required to develop an integrated pest management plan (IMM Plan) and consult with appropriate Mosquito and Vector Control Districts (MVCs) with respect to restoration and conservation activities. Consultation will include, but not be limited to: review of the IMM Plan and best management practices (BMPs) to be implemented at the restoration sites and review of proposed mosquito monitoring efforts at restoration sites and assistance with monitoring efforts where feasible. The Central Valley Joint Venture's Technical guide to Best Management Practices for Mosquito Control in Managed Wetlands (Kwasny et al. 2004) and other guidelines will be used to help design appropriate restoration and conservation features to the extent feasible consistent with the biological goals and objectives of the BDCP. The IMM Plan will address wetland design considerations, water management practices, vegetation management, biological controls, and wetland maintenance. Additional detail on these BMPs is included in Chapter 25 and Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, of the 2013 BDCP Draft EIR/EIS. In particular, see the commitment entitled "Prepare and Implement Mosquito Management Plans."</p> <p>In Chapter 25 of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS, the impact analysis for Impact PH-1 ("Increase in Vector-Borne Diseases as a Result of Construction and Operation of the Intakes, Solids Lagoons, and/or Sedimentation Basins Associated with the Water Conveyance Facilities") has been revised to include discussion of the expansion of Clifton Court Forebay.</p>
489	3	I think that the Through-Delta Conveyance is a much cheaper alternative, which is already known. But I would really like to see them pursue the Through-Delta Conveyance and develop more riparian habitat along those levees.	<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 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>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>Note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A. 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 (1) 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>
489	4	We need to move forward on the off stream storage such as Sikes and Temperance Flat. And try to find some area where we could build another dam. I do not know that Auburn is off the table, but something to that magnitude is definitely needed.	<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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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>For more information regarding water storage please see Master Response 37.</p>
489	5	Rather than spending \$25 billion, which will become \$50 billion on this project, to take that money and get really serious about improving the economics of desalination.	<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 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>
490	1	<p>My suggestion is if the money is going to be paid, the \$25 billion, and if you do a quick calculation with the population of California, 39 million plus, into the 25 billion, that's approximately \$640 per person for every citizen in this state.</p> <p>My city is the city of West Sacramento, 48,744 in the 2010 census. That equates to approximately 31 million or over \$31 million. To me it would be better spent for everyone in this state to do everything in their own home or business and retrofit with drip line and remove all grasses. You could set up programs with this \$25 billion similarly to what the energy programs do or rebates with PG&E, SMUD, et cetera, but just do it focusing on water, instead of doing this whole project -- which will not come in at the \$25 billion as they claim because there is very few government projects that do come in under budget.</p> <p>So my suggestion would be to use all that money to set up conservation programs which would include rain barrels, rainwater reuse, removal of all grass, drip lines, native plants, et cetera, to reduce everyone's water footprint to the absolute minimum. Use Australia as a</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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		template for California, since we both have similar climates and they are at the tail end of a ten year drought and had to make major conservation or policy changes as a result.	<p>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>
491	1	I had some ideas that might help with some of the issues that are evidently public concern. One of the issues was enforcement of illegal fishing, poaching, and that sort of thing. They indicated that they had it in the budget to hire six new . . . Fish and Game wardens. There is a lot of ground to cover. Even with six new people, all these sloughs and all these back roads, it might be smarter to deputize some citizens that might actually have reason to be back there more repeatedly than a game warden. Make them able to stop and ask a person, "Do you have a license? If not, I am going to take down your plate number and I am doing to turn it in, so you are going to go have to prove it." Then maybe some sort of a system that if they get somebody and they find them, that they collect. The person who turned it in could get a stipend of some sort.	The Lead Agencies acknowledge the commenter's suggestion to dealing with illegal harvesting of aquatic resources and poaching of wildlife via "deputizing citizens", though it is outside the scope of the proposed project. The State of California Department of Fish and Wildlife already has a program in place for citizens to assist in identifying poachers and polluters: https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/enforcement/caltip . According to this website: "CalTIP was introduced in California in 1981 in order to give Californians an opportunity to help protect the state's fish and wildlife resources. The toll free telephone number operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. You do not have to give your name."
491	2	<p>I was talking about the noise problem from the pile driving. I was really concerned about the fact that they will not shut the project down because it happens to be noisy. Maybe they could find out where the noise concerns are most concentrated, and then preempt some of the actions that they would take. If this is a problem right here, this is what we can do.</p> <p>Right now people are just saying that they are not going to stop construction just because it gets noisy for somebody or a group.</p> <p>One of the big concerns I had was for the schools here. We have three schools in a small area, so drilling is supposedly on the other side of the water, but I happen to know for a fact that it echoes quite a bit, it goes right over the water. So if it is a problem for the school, what exactly is the plan? What are they going to do if it's so loud that the teachers are complaining that they cannot get the kids to focus or they cannot hear themselves, that kind of thing?</p> <p>I would like more direct answers as to what the plan would be.</p>	<p>Mitigation measures NOI-1a and NOI-1b are available to reduce the effects of noise during construction.</p> <p>The footprint of Intake #2 is located nearest to the Delta High, Clarksburg Middle, and Delta Elementary Charter schools in Clarksburg. Worst-case daytime noise levels during pile driving are indicated in the EIR/EIS. Based on the current footprint, the nearest pile driving locations for Intake #2 are located approximately 5,000 feet from the nearest school (Clarksburg Middle School). As indicated in Table 23-17, at a distance of 5,000 feet, worst-case noise levels during periods of pile driving are predicted to be about 50 dBA Leq (1hr). This assumes an average 100% utilization of pile drivers during construction, in combination with other heavy equipment (mostly heavy trucks). Assuming a conservative outdoor-to-indoor attenuation rate of 20 dB for structures with closed windows, worst-case interior levels would be about 30 dBA. With windows open, the level would be about 40 dBA.</p> <p>The EPA, in its guidance about noise levels and public health states the following: "The principal consideration in the education environment is the prevention of interference with activities, particularly speech communication. An indoor noise level not exceeding Leq(24) of 45 dB is identified as adequate to facilitate thought and communication. Since teaching is occasionally conducted outside the classroom, an outdoor Leq(24) of 55 dB is identified as the maximum level to prevent activity interference." (EPA 1974)</p> <p>Given this standard, noise levels during periods of pile driving are not anticipated to interfere with indoor or outdoor classroom activities.</p>
492	1	My comment is that I understand that maybe up to a billion dollars has been spent on Delta restoration. I am concerned that there is a proposal to spend another \$3 billion, and I cannot really identify where this Delta restoration has already occurred -- so what do I want to say? I am just concerned that the money be spent wisely.	Chapter 8, Implementation Costs and Funding Sources, BDCP, describes the costs of implementing the proposed BDCP conservation measures. Chapter 7, Implementation Structure, describes the ways in which the BDCP Implementation Office would develop budgets and manage expenditures to ensure that Please see Master Response 5 for more information regarding implementation costs.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
493	1	As a resident of Walnut Grove, I am concerned about the tunnel proposal. There have been proposals for through the Delta transveyance, and this is a far superior solution. It allows for the creation of valuable habitat and will provide for the usage of water by the farmers, the fish, other farmers, other fish, and can be used multiple times before it ultimately ends up in the San Joaquin River. This is a much better way than pulling it from the Sacramento and shipping it under the Delta then to the San Joaquin Valley where it will only be used once at the far end and not utilized along the entire distance.	<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 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>
493	2	A big part of this plan should be the correct water conservation and usage within the entire San Joaquin Valley. My experience after driving through the valley recently is that there is inappropriate agriculture taking place, and a great deal of water wasting.	<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>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 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 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
			<p>storage</p> <p>For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.</p>
493	3	I was in a meeting with the head of the Westlands Water District, and he was explaining that they have to drill over 2,000 feet to be able to draw water from their aquifer, at which point it is filled with minerals and it's warm, and they have to cut it with other water to make it usable. This indicates that they have destroyed their resources and now they are coming looking to take advantage of our resources.	<p>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.</p> <p>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 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 allow 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 BDCP water conveyance alternatives can be found in Appendix A Chapter 7 of the RDEIR/SDIES.</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 greatest potential for impacts to groundwater will be during the construction of the intake facilities, pump stations, forebays, and tunnel shafts. It is anticipated that construction of these facilities will require some type of groundwater dewatering immediately adjacent to the construction site while construction activities are underway. For the tunneling work itself, it is anticipated that groundwater presents minimal risk to the project since the tunneling work will be conducted with equipment that is specifically designed to operate under high groundwater conditions. Hence localized dewatering along the tunnel alignment will not be conducted as a regular component of the tunnel mining operation. Localized dewatering along the alignment will be used only in the event of certain maintenance activities, or specialized construction conditions. Geotechnical exploration work is planned in advance of dewatering well installation so that the groundwater regime at each project site can be better understood, which in turn will allow each dewatering system to be uniquely designed and operated in order to limit construction-related effects to the</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>groundwater user adjacent to the construction sites.</p> <p>DWR plans to have a groundwater monitoring and management plan (Plan) in place before construction begins. The Plan will include a process by which baseline groundwater conditions are established along the project corridor, defining groundwater monitoring during and after construction, and establishing mitigation measures to be utilized. The establishment of groundwater baseline information will allow DWR and all relevant parties to develop information on groundwater conditions and consumptive usage patterns. This information will aid in determining if and when any adverse project-related effects to the groundwater during construction activities occur. The baseline monitoring process may include determining variables such as seasonal changes in groundwater level elevations and water quality, the interface of groundwater with surface water and drainage, consumptive usage patterns established by municipal, domestic, and agricultural wells, and crop utilization of the groundwater. The timing, frequency, and duration of the monitoring during and after construction would be determined before construction begins and will be dependent, in part, on the results of the pre-construction monitoring and the documented use of each resource.</p> <p>If a construction-related effect is identified to have occurred, the magnitude, significance, and anticipated duration of the effect will be determined and an appropriate mitigation measure will be utilized. Mitigation measures that may be considered could include deepening of existing wells, the installation of new wells, or providing an alternate source of temporary water. The most appropriate mitigation methodology applied will be determined on a case by case basis in conjunction with the impacted party. For more information see Mitigation Measure GW-1 in Appendix A Chapter 7 Groundwater.</p>
494	1	<p>My comment is just what I am hearing in my little world these days is people who do not even know anything about the Delta are concerned about fracking, and they feel this tunnel is going to facilitate that down in the valley.</p> <p>And it does kind of make me wonder, we are a water-poor state, especially in the south, especially in the drought years like this, and we are going to use all that water to frack, it takes a lot of water, a lot. Not only does it take a lot of water, it ruins a lot of water in the aquifer. So I was just wondering if they're considering that.</p> <p>I imagine it has got to be one of the big economic factors in the state just like agriculture is.</p>	<p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to stipulated beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows. Fracking – or “hydraulic fracturing” -- presumably could be an “industrial” use of water. As of the present, hydraulic fracturing is a lawful use of water, as state law generally permits oil and gas operators to engage in “the injection of air, gas, water, or other fluids into the productive strata, the application of pressure heat or other means for the reduction of viscosity of the hydrocarbons, the supplying of additional motive force, or the creating of enlarged or new channels for the underground movement of hydrocarbons into production wells[.]” (Cal. Pub. Resources Code, § 3106[b].)</p> <p>The state Department of Conservation is currently working on fracking regulations and rules passed by the Legislature have been sent to the governor. Through the rule-making process, the state will better understand how much water is actually used for fracking in California. Voluntary reporting indicates that the use of water for fracking is minimal. The Department of Conservation estimates that statewide, about 270 acre-feet of water per year is used for hydraulic fracture stimulation activities. For comparison’s sake, roughly 5.2 million acre-feet of water a year have been diverted from the Delta, on average, over the last 20 years by the federal and state water projects for farms and cities.</p> <p>The State Water Resources Control Board could modify water permits to balance and protect beneficial uses of water. If the Legislature declared fracking to be unreasonable, it would potentially trigger the State Water Resources Control Board to revise water right permits in such a way as to restrict Delta water from being used for fracking.</p> <p>For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.</p>
495	1	We have one comment and that is I would like to see the time extended for conversation to 365 days. I mean, I think this is really being pushed.	Please see Master Response 39 regarding public review.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
495	2	I'd like to see is have the public be able to vote on this project.	<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> <p>Even so, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>For more information on public outreach efforts, please see Master Response 40.</p>
496	1	<p>I am here to talk about the Delta tunnels that they are trying to implement to come into the area, for the environment and also for the water. I am really worried about the water, because I think there are volumes of water that are going to go down to the Southern California. I think we need the water up here.</p> <p>I think that it will impact areas out there into the Delta. The ecosystem is one thing, but I think that it will hurt a lot of the areas out there, as far as it will make the water more ocean-like, more salty, which is going to hurt the fish in the long run because a lot of fish need the fresh water. It is going to hurt areas out there where people live. It is a beautiful area, if you go out on a boat, to be out on the Delta.</p>	<p>The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. The project would allow the federal and state water projects to deliver water supplies reliably in a way less harmful to fish. The plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. For other points raised by the commenter, refer to the following Master Responses: Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 5 (Conservation Measure 1 as a CM, Overview of Restoration and Enhancement Activities), Master Response 51 (Tunnel Alternative), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), and Master Response 14 (Water Quality). In addition, please refer to the RDEIR/SEIS including Sections 4, 5, and Appendix A (e.g., Chapter 6 [Surface Water], Chapter 8 [Water Quality], Chapter 11 [Fish and Aquatic Resources], and Chapter 12 [Terrestrial Biological Resources]). The discussion of community character is in Chapter 16 of the Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A (Socioeconomics), which identifies the unique features of the Delta and describes the potential effects on Delta communities.</p>
496	2	I think that there is probably a couple reasons they want the water. Probably for the farmers, probably for the wine growers. But also, in the back of my mind, I am thinking that they may want that water for fracking. I think that we need to make sure that that water does not go for fracking anywhere in the state of California.	<p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to stipulated beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows. Fracking – or “hydraulic fracturing” -- presumably could be an “industrial” use of water. As of the present, hydraulic fracturing is a lawful use of water, as state law generally permits oil and gas operators to engage in “the injection of air, gas, water, or other fluids into the productive strata, the application of pressure heat or other means for the reduction of viscosity of the hydrocarbons, the supplying of additional motive force, or the creating of enlarged or new channels for the underground movement of hydrocarbons</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>into production wells[.]” (Cal. Pub. Resources Code, § 3106[b].)</p> <p>The state Department of Conservation is currently working on fracking regulations and rules passed by the Legislature have been sent to the governor. Through the rule-making process, the state will better understand how much water is actually used for fracking in California. Voluntary reporting indicates that the use of water for fracking is minimal. The Department of Conservation estimates that statewide, about 270 acre-feet of water per year is used for hydraulic fracture stimulation activities. For comparison’s sake, roughly 5.2 million acre-feet of water a year have been diverted from the Delta, on average, over the last 20 years by the federal and state water projects for farms and cities.</p> <p>The State Water Resources Control Board could modify water permits to balance and protect beneficial uses of water. If the Legislature declared fracking to be unreasonable, it would potentially trigger the State Water Resources Control Board to revise water right permits in such a way as to restrict Delta water from being used for fracking.</p>
496	3	<p>I also think there should be regulations, as far as how much water can be taken out of the Delta. Even though they say there is, someone has to make that decision.</p> <p>I really feel that the Delta could be done a different way, rather than putting these huge tunnels in. It is going to cost a lot of money. I do not know where the money is coming from, as far as they say certain people are going to be paying, it is going to bring jobs in, but what is it going to do for the whole environment to have these big tunnels? I do not agree with them at all. I do not agree with the tunnels. I think there is other ways to -- for the ecosystem to build up.</p>	<p>DWR’s fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding. Lastly, Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the Draft EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, Draft EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination.</p>
496	4	<p>As far as earthquakes, there has not been an earthquake out there in a billion years. So that is the thing. In the back of my mind, even though they are making it sound like it is for the environment and fish, I do not think it’s going to help the fish. I think it is going to make it worse by having a lot of salt. The fish like the fresh water.</p>	<p>Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, of the Draft EIR/EIS discuss potential consequences of an earthquake to exports; also refer to Master Response 16 (Seismic Activity). Effects of the proposed water conveyance and associated restoration activities on general biological resource areas are discussed in Sections 4 and 5 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Refer also to Appendix A (Chapter 11 Fish and Aquatic Resources; Chapter 12 Terrestrial Biological Resources), and Appendix 3B Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible.</p>
496	5	<p>I think it is going to hurt the communities out there. I think there should be something regulating the fact that that water does not go for fracking anywhere in the state of California. I think that Southern California should do other things besides want our water.</p>	<p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to stipulated beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows. Fracking – or “hydraulic fracturing” -- presumably could be an “industrial” use of water. As of the present, hydraulic fracturing is a lawful use of water, as state law generally permits oil and gas operators to engage in “the injection of air, gas, water, or other fluids into the productive strata, the application of pressure heat or other means for the reduction of viscosity of the hydrocarbons, the supplying of additional motive force, or the creating of enlarged or new channels for the underground movement of hydrocarbons into production wells[.]” (Cal. Pub. Resources Code, § 3106[b].)</p> <p>Pursuant to Senate Bill 4 from 2013 (Stats. 2013, Ch.313), moreover, the state Department of Conservation, through its Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR), is currently working on fracking regulations. An interim set of regulations allowing continued “well stimulation treatments” (including hydraulic fracturing) will remain in effect through 2014, and a new set of proposed regulations should take effect on January 2015. Senate Bill 4 also requires DOGGR, by July 1, 2015, to certify an EIR “in order to</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>provide the public with detailed information regarding any potential environmental impacts of well stimulation in the state." This EIR "shall address the issue of activities . . . that may occur at oil wells in the state existing prior to, and after" January 1, 2014. Through the rule-making process and the statutorily-mandated EIR, the state will better understand how much water is actually used for fracking in California and how much is likely to be used in the foreseeable future. Voluntary reporting indicates that the use of water for fracking is comparatively small, particularly compared with the water usage that has been reported in other states in connection with natural gas recovery. The Department of Conservation estimates that statewide, about 270 acre-feet of water per year is used for hydraulic fracture stimulation activities. For comparison's sake, roughly 5.2 million acre-feet of water a year have been diverted from the Delta, on average, over the last 20 years by the federal and state water projects for farms and cities.</p> <p>The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) could modify water permits to balance and protect beneficial uses of water. If the Legislature declared fracking to be unreasonable, it would potentially trigger the SWRCB to revise water right permits in such a way as to restrict Delta water from being used for fracking.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 34 for additional information regarding use of water delivered by BDCP facilities.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 35 regarding water sources and use in southern California</p>
497	1	<p>I attended today's event just to learn more about the water project. I looked at the BDCP's website, and I also reviewed what KQED had to say about water and things in California.</p> <p>One of the things that I think missed the boat was informing me before I got here that this project for the tunnel, to move water through the Delta, only has to do with restoring the Delta and moving water within the Delta. It does not have anything to do with moving water through California.</p> <p>The impression that I had gotten before I came here today was that this project was instead of the Mendota and the California aqueduct canals that we currently have. Indeed, it is not instead of, it is in addition to. Because I came here with the idea of asking, when do they close the others? Okay?</p> <p>So my point is to go back and make that point up front. If they are going to ask taxpayers to vote for something like this, then we just need to be clear on what we are actually voting for.</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Responses 3 for information on the purpose and need for the Project.</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> <p>Even so, 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 32 in the EIR/EIS and Master Responses 40 and 41 for information related to</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			outreach, transparency of the planning process and stakeholder engagement.
498	1	<p>I am an environmental engineer, and I am still reading the Bay Delta Conservation Plan. Most of it is a very thorough analysis of flora and fauna habitats. The Plan describes how the Conservation measures can affect these habitats and how much permanent loss and fragmentation may be expected. It then sets limits on these maximum losses allowable before remedial action must take place.</p> <p>But who gets to say if these are the right limits? Should not the voters get to choose how much of the environment they allow to be reduced? Or should we leave it to the experts? If so, what experts? Who has jurisdiction? Is environmental protection a state or federal issue?</p>	<p>The Proposed Project has been developed with the goals of minimizing and avoiding incidental take of listed species to the maximum extent practicable. Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 12, Terrestrial Biological Resources, EIR/EIS, describe effects of the Proposed Project and several alternatives on fish and wildlife species in the Plan Area.</p> <p>Section 7 requires that federal agencies, in consultation with the federal fish and wildlife agencies, ensure that their actions are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of species or result in modification or destruction of critical habitat.</p> <p>Where the alternative does not include preparation of an HCP, ESA compliance for construction and operation of water intakes in the north Delta and associated conveyance facilities would be achieved solely through Section 7. For these alternatives, USFWS and NMFS would not issue a permit and would not act as a lead agency for NEPA compliance. Where Section 7 is the ESA compliance strategy, USFWS and NMFS will assume roles as cooperating agencies for purposes of the NEPA review.</p> <p>Reclamation would be the lead federal action agency for Section 7 compliance where a non-HCP alternative is selected. Reclamation's Section 7 compliance would be expected to also address the Section 7 compliance needs for the USACE permit actions. In cooperation with DWR, Reclamation would prepare a biological assessment (BA) for submission to USFWS and NMFS requesting formal consultation under ESA Section 7.</p> <p>A biological opinion is not required prior to the release of the Draft BDCP/CWF EIR/EIS. For the Proposed Action, the USFWS and NMFS will conduct an internal ESA section 7 consultation prior to issuance of an Section 10(a)(1)(B) permit for the Proposed Action. These federal agencies will coordinate the ESA consultation process and other environmental review processes, such as the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), consistent with federal regulations. In addition, the USFWS and NMFS will consult with the United States Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) to complete biological opinions or a joint biological opinion prior to federal action to carry out the BDCP.</p> <p>For more information please see 1.1.5.2 of Section 1 Introduction of the RDEIR/SDEIS.</p>
498	2	<p>The Plan talks about budget, but what will it take to get the project started? It establishes monitoring and sets decision trees to evaluate adverse effects. The Plan also states unresolved contingencies are expected and cannot be estimated at this time. What is not mentioned in the budget is if the maximum habitat losses are exceeded, what the remedial action will be, and how much it will cost.</p> <p>Not only will we have to pay to build the project, we also have to pay to monitor this environment, and then pay for any necessary corrective actions. Since any realized damage cannot be known ahead of time, the budget is inherently open-ended and can be unpredictable.</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>
498	3	<p>With this environmental impact and unlimited budget, it will be tough to get support. To get the public to support and approve the budget for this project, I recommend you should promote the significant advantages. For example, the modelled scenarios in the Bay Delta Conservation Plan show Conservation Measure 1, or the tunnels project, will increase water flows enough to mobilize or pick up methyl-mercury deposited by Sierra mining. So the tunnels will pick up mercury from the Delta sediment and pump it out the aqueduct. I am sure Northern California citizens would be in favor of that. You should tell the public of the significant advantages so you can get their support for this project. So I view this as a</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> <p>Even so, 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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		way to clean the contaminants out of the Delta.	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 32 in the EIR/EIS and Master Responses 40 for information related to public outreach efforts.</p>
499	1	I speak for the rivers. I believe that you can determine the health of the planet by the health of its rivers. Our rivers have been de-watered and diverted and dammed, parenthesis, in most senses of the word, closed parenthesis. The BDCP Plan only enhances the risk of further degradation of our most precious rivers.	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. 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.
499	2	I speak for the fish and the wildlife. Tragically, the decline of our once abundant fisheries and wildlife habitat only accelerate on the BDCP Plan. Environmental protections already in place have been hard-won and deemed to be the minimum necessary to ensure the survival of critical species. The BDCP Plan, and even the drought, should not trump the necessary protections.	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.
499	3	<p>I speak for the voters. As a voter and a taxpayer, I am offended by the clever legislative and bureaucratic tactics engaged in by the backer of this plan to push this project through without a vote of the people. Their fears should be noted.</p> <p>Common sense, fair play, and transparency demand that the voters be given the opportunity to decide.</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> <p>Even so, 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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>For information pertaining to how comments have been considered and addressed, please refer to Master Response 42. Please see Master Response 40 for additional detail on public outreach efforts that have been made on this project.</p>
499	4	<p>I speak for seven generations. We have an obligation to ensure that our children and our children's children will have the benefit of the natural resources that belong to all. As Chief Seattle said in his letter to the president who wanted to buy their land, quote, the shining water that moves in the streams and rivers is not just water, but the blood of our ancestors. If we sell you our land, you must remember that it is sacred. Each glossy reflection in the clear waters of the lakes tell of events and memories in the life of my people. The water's murmur is the voice of my father's father. The rivers are our brothers. They quench our thirst. They carry our canoes and feed our children. So you must give the rivers the kindness that you would give any brother. Will you teach your children what we have taught our children, that the Earth is our mother? What befalls the Earth befalls all the sons of the Earth.</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>