| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| 100 | 1 | Since the partial completion of the State Water Project in the early 1970s, Calleguas has been virtually 100 percent reliant on this water supply. As such, resolution of decades-long water resource issues in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta is of the highest priority for Calleguas and its 630,000 water users in Ventura County. As evidence of this, in 2014, broad support for the Bay Delta Conservation Plan was fervently expressed in a Ventura County coalition letter signed by 26 cities, agencies, and organizations (attached hereto). We remain steadfast in our endorsement of this effort. | 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.<br><br>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. |
| 101 | 1 | Please clarify the comment deadline for the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix Partially Recirculated DEIR/DEIS, SCH Number: 2008032062<br><br>Document Type: EIR - Draft EIR<br><br>Alternate Title: Bay Delta Conservation Plan<br><br>Project Lead Agency: Water Resources, Department of<br><br>According to the website http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/2015PublicReview/PublicReviewRDEIRSDEIS.aspx the comment period ends October 30, 2015 as stated:<br><br>"Public Review Partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report/Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (RDEIR/SDEIS)<br><br>The Partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report/Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (RDEIR/SDEIS) is being made available to the public in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).<br><br>The comment period begins July 10, 2015. Comments must be received electronically or postmarked on or before October 30, 2015. For more information on how to submit comments, click here."<br><br>The October 30, 2015 deadline for comments conflicts with what is shown on the website https://s3.amazonaws.com/californiawater/pdfs/FIX_eBlast_7-9-15.pdf which states:<br><br>"The revised environmental document is being made available for public review and comment from July 10, 2015 through August 31, 2015." | This comment has already been addressed in the form of a correction made on the factsheet found at the website https://s3.amazonaws.com/californiawater/pdfs/FIX_eBlast_7-9-15.pdf. |
| 102 | 1 | Time and time again your system is proven to fail. You have covered our faces far too many times with blindfolds of distractions, lies and misleading objectives. Some to blind, some to mislead and some simply in plain view. With no thought, no care, only to fill your greed. You seem to forget one thing. We have seen you your wicked ways. We have stripped you from your sheep costumes and seen the hungry wolf. My people have cultivated and lived in this land for many years. In fact I am a native Californian. I am a proud child of a farmero (sic). Third generation field worker. We have drank the water and cultivated our land here for a beautiful tomorrow. The land and water have provided for many families. For many, many years. Many moons have passed. From the time the water flowed freely. To the time you decided to start putting in dams. Our people flourished from the delta and now you want to lie to us and tell us that these tunnels are for the better? To benefit other farms, farmers, and provide drinking water for others? Lies! Lies! Lies! We know about the oil giants' | 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.<br><br>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 45 |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | involvement and investments. We know how many billions of water is used for hydraulic fracturing (fracking) Kern County. We know how much it will cost us taxpayers. We know how you will destroy all of our nature, fish, families, jobs. We know! In the end you will run us dry till our tears are the only thing left for us to drink... I will do what I can to voice and educate our people about your harmful, dishonest solutions, delusions, lies! I will end my words with one of my favorite speeches by Judi Bari, environmental activist's speech, June 1996.<br><br>"Capitalism, first of all, is based on the principle of private property--of certain humans owning the earth for the purpose of exploiting it for profit. At an earlier stage, capitalists even believed they could own other humans. But just as slavery has been discredited in the mores of today's dominant world view, so do the principles of biocentrism discredit the concept that humans can own the earth." | (Purpose and Need).<br><br>Impacts to agriculture are identified and discussed in Chapter 14; lead agencies have proposed measures that would support and protect agricultural production in the Delta by securing agricultural easements and/or by seeking opportunities to protect and enhance agriculture with a focus on maintaining economic activity on agricultural lands. Please see Master Response 22 for more information on agricultural mitigation.<br><br>Refer to Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use Of Water), Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply). |
| 103 | 1 | According to the BDCP EIR/EIS, the operation of the twin tunnels, coupled with the impacts of climate change, will drain Trinity Reservoir by up to 19%, Shasta Reservoir by up to 20%, Folsom Reservoir by up to 31%, and Oroville Reservoir by up to 32%. The result may be even lower flows (particularly in the fall) in the Trinity, Sacramento, American, and Feather Rivers than we are witnessing now during one of California's driest years on record. The Sacramento River's flow downstream of the project's three new water intakes (located just south of Sacramento) will be reduced all year long. | In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders.<br><br>As described in Chapter 5, Water Supplies, and Appendix 5A, Section A, of the EIR/EIS, the EIR/EIS analyzed the effects of the climate change and sea level rise in the Delta and in the reservoirs in the Delta watershed, and population growth that would occur without the project through the comparison of conditions under the No Action Alternative to conditions under the Existing Conditions. The comparison of conditions under the proposed project and action alternatives to conditions under the No Action Alternative indicates the effects of the alternatives. As shown in Chapter 5 and Appendix 5A, Section C, of the EIR/EIS, storage in Trinity Lake, Shasta Lake, and Lake Oroville would be less under the No Action Alternative than under Existing Conditions due to climate change, sea level rise, and population growth that would occur with or without the project. Storage in Trinity Lake and Shasta Lake would be similar under the proposed project and the No Action Alternative. Storage in Lake Oroville would be similar under the proposed project and the No Action Alternative, except in the summer months when storage would be less than 10 percent lower under the proposed project as compared to the No Action Alternative. |
| 103 | 2 | The 45 mile-long twin Delta tunnels and their fresh water intakes, forebays, tunnel debris disposal sites, and additional facilities will eat up at least 5,700 acres of Delta farmland and wildlife habitat. Some of the facilities and debris disposal sites will be located on Brannan Island State Park and on conservation land purchased with public funds to provide habitat for the threatened Sandhill crane. The diversion intakes, access roads, lights and other urban intrusions associated with these facilities will be directly adjacent to the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge and Delta Meadows State Park. | This comment is a summary of some of the facilities and effects of the project as presented 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 is intended to be environmentally beneficial. No substantive comment about the contents or process of the EIR/EIS is provided so not additional response is necessary. |
| 103 | 3 | This is just not a good idea; please stop this nonsense and listen to people | 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. |
| 104 | 1 | I [am] still sure you will not be good stewards of our Delta waters. You still want to take almost 5 million cubic feet of water before it hits the Delta. Without proving beyond a doubt | 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 |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | in a dry year you won't stop send[ing] water south, rendering our Delta full of salt water. If the cap on the water, who shuts it off, is strictly away from the state controls and southern water users we in the north part of the state will end up as a desert, like Owens Valley. [sic] | conditions in the south Delta do not permit diversions from the existing State Water Project and Central Valley Project 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.<br><br>The three new alternatives—4A, 2D, and 5A— maintain the existing compliance point at Emmaton, would not result in significant impacts due to EC objective exceedance at Emmaton. Also, Alternatives 4A, 2D and 5A would have less water quality effects in the western Delta related to EC, and would have fewer exceedances of the fish and wildlife EC objective between Prisoners Point and Jersey Point, such that it was feasible to introduce mitigation that would prevent significant impacts related to EC increases. After introduction of these mitigation measures, Alternatives 4A, 2D and 5A were determined to result in less than significant impacts for EC. Finally, Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A would not result in substantial degradation in the western Delta due to increased chloride concentrations, thus, the effects on chloride were determined to be less than significant.<br><br>Additional discussion of these EC and chloride analyses is included in Section 2.2.1 of the RDEIR/SDEIS, and Chapter 8, Water Quality ,and Appendix 8H, Electrical Conductivity, of this Final EIR/EIS. Please also refer to Master Response 14 (Water Quality) for additional information regarding salinity. |
| 104 | 2 | I just think our Governor wants a legacy project that will outlive his father's legacy project. | The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. |
| 105 | 1 | As a California resident, I am adamantly opposed to the twin tunnels water grab by Kern County mega-agri business interests. This plan will definitely cause irreparable harm to one of the most diverse ecosystems on the planet, the California Delta. It makes no sense to irrigate the desert for the benefit of a few very rich senior water rights holder to the detriment of thousands of Delta citizens. Just say no to the tunnels. | No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.<br><br>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. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water). |
| 108 | 1 | On behalf of the Delta Protection Commission, I am writing to request an additional 60-day extension in the comment period for the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP)/California WaterFix Recirculated Draft EIR (RDEIR)/Supplemental Draft EIS (SDEIS), beyond the extension to October 30, 2015 that was announced this week.<br><br>We have heard from Delta interests that more time is needed to understand the revised Delta isolated conveyance proposal. While an additional 60 days beyond the originally announced 52-day comment period is welcome, more time is needed to ensure that all interested parties have an opportunity to provide meaningful review and comment. | The public review for the Partially Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS on the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California Water Fix was open from July 10, 2015 through August 31, 2015, which exceeds the requirements in CEQA/NEPA. For additional information regarding the public review process, please see Master Response 39. |
| 109 | 1 | I would support new dams and storage facilities but spending billions on new tunnels is a nonstarter! It adds no storage or capacity and has the perception of setting up a water grab in the future. No tunnels, no way. | Please refer to Master Response 37 for additional information about water storage. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. |
| 110 | 1 | As a 30 [year] owner of a house on the Sacramento River (Long Island), I have watched the river water quality and quantity decline.<br><br>There are less fish in the system and more invasive species of weeds etc.<br><br>The Bay Delta Conservation Plan must include the following: | In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife.<br><br>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | No tunnels;<br><br>Increased areas for water storage in heavy water years;<br><br>A strong effort to eliminate the weed problem. | and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in increased water storage, elimination of invasive species including aquatic weeds in the Delta, agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).<br><br>Division of Boating and Waterways implements the aquatic weed control program annually within the Delta to control invasive weeds, like water hyacinth and Egeria.<br><br>For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3. |
| 111 | 1 | The Tunnel project suggested by Governor Brown is a travesty against the Delta estuaries and a blight against the river Delta region! Any political ploy designed to marginalize the destruction of the Delta waterways or any attempt by your organization to concoct phony made up stories to make the general public believe this project will improve water distribution and conservancy will not be taken or met with lightly!<br><br>No tunnels, means no tunnels! | 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. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need). |
| 112 | 1 | Delta twin tunnels are last link in the California system:<br><br>No discussion about the future of the Delta can be complete without a good understanding of the historic proposals for this estuary. Since the early planning stages of the Central Valley Project of the 1930s, it has always been proposed that some sort of Delta Cross Canal or tunnel be built to transport water either around or under the Delta.<br><br>With respect to fresh water inflows into the Delta, history shows that before the several dams of the Central Valley Project (CVP) were completed in the 1940s, salinity intrusion into the Delta was a serious problem during times of drought. [Footnote 1: Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Atlas, page 53, State of California Department of Water Resources, August 1987] Since the CVP started releasing water into the Sacramento River, Delta farmers have had a more dependable supply of high quality irrigation water, even during high tides and low rain fall years.<br><br>One of the goals of the CVP was to provide fresh water to flush out the brackish water that creeps into the Delta during high tides. But another element of the CVP that was never built was a Delta Cross Canal. Water was to be pumped out of the Sacramento River, below Sacramento City, and conveyed along the eastern edge of the Delta through improved sloughs and man-made canals to the pumping stations on the south side of Delta. [Footnote 2: The Central Valley Project, page 125, California State Department of Education, 1942]<br><br>In 1957 the California Water Plan issued by the Department of Water Resources envisioned a more elaborate project to move water around the Delta named the Trans-Delta System. At its heart the Trans-Delta System would have had control structures on the Sacramento River and Steamboat Slough to divert water into the Delta Cross Channel located below Walnut Creek and then into a Delta Cross Canal. [Footnote 3: Bulletin No. 3 The California Water Plan, page 186, California Department of Water Resources, May 1957] Another element was a siphon under the Sacramento River east of Collinsville that would deliver water near Antioch. Known as the Antioch Crossing, the proposed siphon tunnel was to be 3,000 foot long with a diameter of 25 feet. The overall length of the Antioch Cross project was to be 33 miles in length and have capacity of 17,000 second-feet and transport 11,250,000 | This comment is consistent with information presented in Chapter 1, Introduction, and Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need, in the EIR/S. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | acre-feet of water per season. [Footnote 4: Bulletin No. 3 The California Water Plan, page 187, California Department of Water Resources, May 1957]<br><br>Both the CVP and California State Water Project (SWP) engineers understood that the Delta could never handle the volume of water it was being asked to transfer from north to south for an indefinite period of time without damage to the Delta itself. Only because this tidal estuary was reclaimed during the 19th and 20th centuries was it minimally suited to aid in the transport of water from the north side of the Delta to the south side. Had the thousands of miles of levees not been built along rivers and sloughs in Delta, the Central Valley Project would have had to build a canal around the Delta.<br><br>The CVP and SWP have provided flood protection for Sacramento Valley communities and helped maintain high quality fresh water in the Delta to be used by farmers to grow crops. The large amount of fresh water released into the Delta from the Sacramento River and the export of a like amount of water to the southern end of the Delta has contributed to what scientists tell us is an ecological disaster for the Delta's fisheries. This combined with the fragility of the Delta levees susceptible to collapse from either earthquake or flood makes the construction of the proposed twin tunnels project almost a necessity. | |
| 112 | 2 | Opponents of any Delta Cross Canal or Tunnel need to realize that vast amount of water conserved behind the CVP [Central Valley Project] and SWP [State Water Project] dams is under contract to irrigation and water districts south of the Delta. The dams of Folsom, Oroville, Shasta and Trinity were specifically built to release water during the summer for farmers and residents in the San Joaquin Valley and Southern California. It is unfortunate that a conveyance project across the Delta was never built under the CVP or SWP.<br><br>While I don't always agree with how either the San Joaquin Valley farmers or Southern California residents use the water that is exported to them, that doesn't negate the fact that they have a contract for the delivery of the water. They are not stealing or grabbing Northern California water. They are buying the water stored behind dams constructed expressly for that purpose.<br><br>It's time to build the missing links of California's water system and construct the most environmentally responsible proposed project to date for conveying water across the Delta: the BDCP twin tunnels. | 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. |
| 113 | 1 | As a homeowner on the Delta, we strongly disagree with the tunnel portion of this plan. It [simply] makes no sense any way you look at it. | 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. |
| 114 | 1 | Please do not keep extending the comment time. Get working on the water fix plan. People are depending on you. The Water Fix plan is reasonable. Get moving; the water problems will only get worse. | 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. |
| 115 | 1 | Support Alternative 4A -- the California Water Fix and distilled water from catalytic depolymerization of recycled waste.<br><br>As for maintaining higher reservoir levels in less precipitated areas of California, such a facility allows for around 1.7 million gallons of clean water from an Alphakat KDV 1000 annually. If multiple plants are erected, then it will accumulate even more natural resources needed for California. For these reasons, I support the California Water Fix and replenishing | 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.<br><br>The scope and purpose of the proposed project is much more limited. As explained in Chapter 2 Project |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | the reservoirs through Alphakat systems | Objectives and Purpose and Need of the Final EIR/EIS. the fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the State Water Project (SWP) system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and Central Valley Project (CVP) south-of-Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework with statutory and contractual obligations. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised. |
| 116 | 1 | Just as we need long term strategic management of the economy to defend against the economic crisis, we also need a long term strategic fix for our water management system in California. I support any and all water management plans that advance our ability to control our water in a cost effective and fair way. Clearly long term water storage, water allocation, and allocation based on fair, equitable and sound economic decisions. | 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.<br><br>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 agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). |
| 117 | 1 | I support the California Water Fix. As a mother of two children I would like to help ensure that my kids will have a reliable water source in their future. It's time to make changes while being smart, conservation conscientious, and progressive towards California's future residents. | 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.<br><br>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. |
| 118 | 1 | How is California's water used?<br><br>Posted June 25, 2015 in Banners<br><br>The common misconception is that farmers use 80% of the water in California. That's simply not true and here's why:<br><br>According to the California Department of Water Resources (DWR), water is divided between three distinctly different users: agriculture, urban users…and the environment. In the California Water Plan, or Bulletin 160, DWR accounts using this chart:<br><br>Urban-8.9%, Ag-40.8%, Environment-50.3%<br><br>In short, what DWR is saying is that water that isn't used by farmers or cities and industry is water that is set aside for the environment, which is good! Californians cherish a healthy environment and our elected leaders have passed laws and regulations that provide about half of the state's developed water supply for environmental protection. | 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.<br><br>This comment is consistent with information presented in Section 5.1.1.3 in Chapter 5, Water Supply, of the EIR/EIS. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. |
| 119 | 1 | Support Alternative 4A - the California Water Fix<br><br>Funds designated for the bullet train should be diverted to this project, as this is more important and a much higher priority. | 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. |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. |
| 120 | 1 | I am writing to express my strong disagreement with the California Water Fix (Alternative 4A). It represents an unconscionable boondoggle that has little chance of succeeding. The tunnels do not make any new water. Only desalination can do that. | Appendix 1C of the Final EIR/EIS, Demand Management Measures, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. Refer to Master Response 6 for more information on demand management. Although components such as desalination plants and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the State, they are beyond the scope of the project. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 7 (Desalination). |
| 120 | 2 | The tunnels are priced at an abnormally high rate that will harm Californians and, eventually, all agriculture and do nothing to protect the natural environment in the Delta.<br><br>We urge the Department of Water Resources and the Administration to stand down from the WaterFix and drop this boondoggle!<br><br>We need a less costly system on the nature of a through-delta conveyance with reinforced levees. | DWR acknowledges your opposition to the project. Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on the costs of project implementation. |
| 120 | 3 | You need to update our aging governor on the practicality of a non-tunnel project.<br><br>For these reasons, I am against the California Water Fix! | The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. |
| 121 | 1 | I am writing to express my strong disagreement with the California Water Fix (Alternative 4A). It represents an unconscionable boondoggle that has little chance of succeeding. The tunnels do not make any new water. | DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. |
| 121 | 2 | The tunnels are priced at an abnormally high rate that will harm Californians and, eventually, all agriculture and do nothing to protect the natural environment in the Delta.<br><br>We urge the Department of Water Resources and the Administration to stand down from the WaterFix and drop this boondoggle!<br><br>We need a less costly system on the nature of a through-delta conveyance with reinforced levees. You need to update our aging governor on the practicality of a non-tunnel project.<br><br>For these reasons, I am against the California Water Fix! | In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 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 agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).<br><br>The construction of the water delivery facilities is estimated to cost $14.9 billion, an amount that would be paid for by the state and federal water contractors who rely on Delta exports. The range of costs for water vary widely among contractors south of the Delta. Costs depend on the source of water, transport facilities, energy requirements, among other factors. For the agricultural customers of the CVP, prices range from $100 per acre-foot to more than $400 per acre-foot. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, which buys water from the SWP, estimates that the cost of the proposed project would translate into about $5.00 extra per household, per month in its service area. The final cost of water from the new conveyance facilities would be determined by numerous factors. A number of these significant factors, such as the project yield and allocation of costs, have yet to be determined. Please see Master Response 5 for |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | information regarding funding of the proposed project. |
| 122 | 1 | I am writing to express my strong disagreement with the California WaterFix (Alternative 4A). It represents a thoroughly inept plan to further damage California's aging water distribution system that supplies water to 25 million Californians and 3 million acres of farmland, while also destroying the natural environment in the Delta.<br><br>We urge the Department of Water Resources and the Administration to fire half the people involved with this boondoggle and make the other half start doing some work.<br><br>The state's water system and the Delta environment are at risk. We must find methods to create new water to keep pace with California's increasing population.<br><br>The California WaterFix (Alternative 4A) is the culmination of nearly a decade of extensive inept review, planning and scientific and environmental analysis by the stooges of Stuart Resnick and the water barons. It is basically putting lipstick on a pig (no insult to pigs intended).<br><br>Getting to this point has been a long and thoroughly inept process. The time to fire everyone associated with this crazy idea is now.<br><br>For these reasons, I do not support the California WaterFix. | 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.<br><br>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project |
| 122 | 2 | According to the shadowy astroturf group Californians for Water Security, The California WaterFix proposes replacing "dirt levees with a modern, secure water pipeline," a stupid crackpot idea -- replacing all the levees with a pipeline would cost in the hundreds of billions of dollars and destroy the Delta. | In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease 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 exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries in drier periods. However, the proposed project would not replace any of the Delta levees, and the Delta channels would continue to be used for portions of the year to convey water to the south Delta intakes. |
| 124 | 1 | Support Alternative 4A - the California Water Fix. We have no grass, catch rain in barrels, use bath water to flush toilets, a plastic bucket under the faucets for dish and hand washing, use a broom instead of a hose, and have four dirty autos. | 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.<br><br>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. |
| 125 | 1 | Never in the history of the state of California has a developer had to bring a new source of water to their development. They take more water out of the water resources we use. This must change! Any new development much find and bring water from a new source. | 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.<br><br>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. |
| 126 | 1 | I am writing to express my strong disagreement with the California Water Fix (Alternative 4A). It represents an unconscionable boondoggle that has little chance of succeeding. The | 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 |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | tunnels do not make any new water. Only desalination can do that. | and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.<br><br>For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. |
| 126 | 2 | The tunnels are priced at an abnormally high rate that will harm Californians and, eventually, all agriculture and do nothing to protect the natural environment in the Delta.<br><br>We urge the Department of Water Resources and the Administration to stand down from the WaterFix and drop this boondoggle!<br><br>We need a less costly system on the nature of a through-delta conveyance with reinforced levees. You need to update our aging governor on the practicality of a non-tunnel project.<br><br>For these reasons, I am against the California Water Fix! | 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.<br><br>In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 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 agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). |
| 127 | 1 | Ban fracking! It is the biggest danger to clean water in every state, not just California. | State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to 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, and is a lawful use of water. 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. Please see Master Response 34 for additional information regarding use of water delivered by proposed water conveyance facilities.<br><br>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.<br><br>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. |
| 128 | 1 | On July 10, 2015, the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California Water Fix (Project) Partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report/Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (RDEIR/SDEIS) was released with a 52 day public review and comment period scheduled to end on August 31, 2015. Given the complexity of the proposed revisions and additions on the rebranded Project, alternatives, and proposed mitigation in nearly 8,000 pages of documentation and analysis, the RDEIR/SDEIS will reasonably require more than 52 | The comment period for the RDEIR/SDEIS was extended by 60 days to October 30, 2015. The ESA compliance process and the State Board's change in point of diversion petition process are proceeding concurrently with preparation of this Final EIR/EIS. The biological assessment has been coordinated with the EIR/EIS to ensure the contents of these two documents are consistent. |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | days to review. Sacramento County requests the comment period be extended to 45 days after the public release/notice of the two following documents: The Petition to Change the Point of Diversion for the Project by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), and the biological assessment resulting from the Project's Section 7 consultation. Extending the RDEIR/SDEIS comment period until after these two critical documents are released for public comment will allow a better understanding of the rebranded Project and its impacts, providing the public a more meaningful review. Alternatively, Sacramento County (County) requests a 120 day extension to provide meaningful review and comments. | |
| 128 | 2 | The RDEIR/SDEIS contains substantial changes from the initial public draft. The RDEIR/SDEIS describes three new project alternatives and their mitigation in an excess of 2,200 pages, not including related figures, modeling, or redline appendices comparisons. But in addition to these voluminous changes and modifications, the recently released documents also include revisions to the BDCP Habitat Conservation Plan (Appendix D), analysis concerning the Project's consistency with the Delta Plan (Appendix G), and modeling titled in a manner suggesting it will support petitions that Project proponents will file with the SWRCB [State Water Resources Board] (Appendix C). The inclusion of this material in the RDEIR/SDEIS is unexpected and previously undisclosed. In light of these surprise actions, and to adequately evaluate and analyze the RDEIR/SDEIS for related CEQA/NEPA impacts, the County will first need to receive and review these other, forthcoming documents containing information relevant to project impacts: the Section 7 Biological Assessment and its supporting documentation, and the SWRCB petition filings. | Please see response to comment 128-1. |
| 128 | 3 | The federal agencies and Project proponents have continued the practice of frustrating the public review process through a lack of transparency. While [Sacramento] County is party to a Cooperating Agency Agreement dictating the roles, responsibilities, and commitments of federal Lead and Cooperating Agencies pursuant to NEPA, the federal agencies ignored the Agreement's covenants during the first part of 2015, thus limiting Cooperating Agency involvement in the development of the RDEIR/SDEIS by, in part, failing to provide preliminary deliverables like technical analyses and information for review and comment prior to this public release. Further, the federal agencies and Project proponents continue to withhold responses to prior comments, refusing to post and share comments as they were and are submitted. To this end, County staff from almost every department and discipline must identify, coordinate, review, and draft responses to the voluminous new documents to both highlight the new information and analyses' general flaws as well as their unique impacts to County infrastructure, traffic, health and human services, historic Delta communities and agricultural land, air quality, water quality, flood issues, and public safety issues. The continued lack of communication, collaboration, and transparency from the federal agencies and Project proponents, in contravention of the County's Cooperating Agency Agreement and sound public policy, results in the County being unable to efficiently and effectively provide its NEPA/CEQA analyses for the revised document within a 52 day review period. | The commenter indicates that there was a lack of communication during the preparation of the EIR/EIS. See Master Response 41 for more details. The lead agencies do consider the input provided by the cooperating and responsible agencies and the public during the process. There may be conflicting suggestions and comments raised by various entities. The lead agencies are then in a situation where they must make a decision on which way to proceed and understand that all parties may not agree with the outcome. |
| 128 | 4 | [Sacramento] County continues to address the statewide and regionally devastating drought. The same staff tasked with providing meaningful, detailed analysis and comments to the RDEIR/SDEIS are needed to implement and execute water supply shortage measures, outreach, and mitigation during this most critical period of the drought emergency. Failing to extend the short 52 day comment period in light of the unprecedented current drought conditions and their corresponding challenges will deprive the County of the time necessary to adequately review and comment on these new documents integral to its future. The | The comment period for the RDEIR/SDEIS was extended by 60 days to October 30, 2015. For more information about the public review period, please see Master Response 39. To facilitate an easier review of the changes in the RDEIS/SDEIS, as compared to the Draft EIR/EIS, a version of the document was made available that included hyperlinks and track changes, in addition to a Section 508-compliant version. |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | County is among the communities most affected by the proposed actions of the BDCP and Project, and should be provided sufficient time to return insightful, consequential comments on the RDEIR/SDEIS. | |
| 128 | 5 | In the name of sound and reasonable public policy, the new generation of Delta ecosystem restoration and water supply (reliability) projects and programs require and deserve a thorough evaluation and analysis. [Sacramento] County therefore respectfully requests that the public comment period for the RDEIR/SDEIS be extended to 45 days after the public release of the SWRCB [State Water Resources Control Board] petitions for the Project, and the biological assessment resulting from the Project's Section 7 consultation. At the least, the public comment period should be extended until after critical drought months pass and expert staff are once again available to thoroughly review the documents (a minimum of 120 additional days). | The comment period for the RDEIR/SDEIS was extended by 60 days to October 30, 2015. The ESA compliance process and the State Board's change in point of diversion petition process is proceeding concurrently with preparation of this Final EIR/EIS. Although this request was not approved, the lead agencies have made every reasonable attempt to provide an adequate public review period for agencies, stakeholders, and the public. For additional information regarding the public review period, please Master Response 39. |
| 129 | 1 | Just because you label a 'plan' a conservation plan, it does not make it a conservation plan. What are you conserving? I do not see conservation. I see destruction. What am I missing?<br><br>I am against the BDCP/California WaterFix Partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report/Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (RDEIR/SDEIS), as it does not adequately address the concerns I had with your Draft EIR/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. 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. |
| 130 | 1 | We are 100% against the tunnels.<br><br>They will not fix any state water system problems we have. What they will do is cost the taxpayers of this state a great deal of money, damage the Delta, and take more water from northern California, sending it to southern California. Remember, Owens Valley was once a rich farming area. It is now a desert, thanks to southern California. Do something that helps conserve water from the good years, to see us through droughts. Do not ruin another huge agricultural area. | No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.<br><br>The proposed project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply.<br><br>Water delivered to the SWP and CVP water contractors participating in proposed project would be within the existing contract amounts to serve agricultural lands that have been cultivated and existing and planned community populations, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply.<br><br>It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management). |
| 132 | 1 | It is getting so that citizens have no voice in what state government is doing and judges are continuing to override voters. If they decide to destroy the Delta wetlands by allowing salt water intrusion, where will farmers get their water for irrigation to the most fertile land in California? This is not about little fish or the ecosystem, it is about destroying farmland.<br><br>Southern corporate farmers average 2,200 acres in farm size, with 50 farms having over 42,000 acres. These farms started by flooding the land with water from the Delta, that washed alkali into the Kesterson Reservoir National Wildlife Refuge. Without water flow to keep salt water from encroaching the Delta further, we will, without question, be destroyed.<br><br>I think citizens living in the Central Valley should decide their own fate. I think money should | The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. In its efforts to achieve the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration, the California WaterFix seeks to protect dozens of species of fish and wildlife in the Delta while also securing reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California. Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed California WaterFix. Please refer to Master Response 14, Water Quality, for more details regarding effects of the alternatives on salinity levels. |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | not be a part of the decision, or who you owe to political donors. | |
| 133 | 1 | I would like to address this issue with the following statement -- no, no, no! This will not fix anything. Please look at alternative measures that, in the long run, will assure all of California the water it so desperately needs. Conservation of water should be at the top of the list. More watersheds, more reservoirs, more ways of containing rain, when it comes. Please, I beg you, as someone who lives on the Delta, do not destroy this beautiful place. | It is important to note, as an initial matter, 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. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 (Demand Management) for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.<br><br>Additional water storage was eliminated from consideration in the Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS through the alternatives development and screening process (discussed in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives). As such, the proposed project does not propose storage as a project component. Although the proposed project would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, Alternative 4A is a stand-alone project which demonstrates independent utility just as future storage projects would demonstrate. Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives) and 56 (Storage) for additional information.<br><br>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. |
| 134 | 1 | How will construction of the tunnels over a fourteen-year period help with drought? | During the construction period of the tunnel the water supply would not change from existing conditions. The benefits associated with water supply reliability will not be recognized until the Water Fix infrastructure is constructed and in operation. Refer to Master Response 47 (Drought and California WaterFix). |
| 134 | 2 | Will the state conduct a full cost-benefit analysis of the project that includes the value of freshwater to the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary? | DWR is revising the Socioeconomic Impact Analysis for the project based on changes included in the RDEIR/SDEIS. |
| 134 | 3 | How much water is available for export through the tunnels in a drought after prior water rights and public trust needs are met? And if there isn't any, how often will the tunnels be dry? | The total amount of water exported by month in each water year type for each action alternative is presented in Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Model Results, of the EIR/EIS. As shown in Appendix 5A, the north Delta intake tunnels would not be fully utilized except for a few months in wet years. However, it is important to have the maximum capacity in the intakes and tunnels during those periods of time to convey water during extremely wet periods to areas south of the Delta for storage and use during drier times. The hydrologic analysis in the EIR/S considered changes over long-term conditions which includes high flow events and drought periods, conditions similar to the 1976-1977 and 1987-1992 droughts, as described in Appendix 5A, Modeling Technical Appendix.<br><br>The range of alternatives in the EIR/EIS includes alternatives which result in reductions in SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta as compared to the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative and Alternatives 4H1, 4H2, 4H3, 4H4; 5; 6A, 6B, 6C; 7; 8; and 9 would result in less SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta than under Existing Conditions (shown in Tables 5-5 and 5-8). Similarly, Alternatives 6A, 6B, 6C; 7; 8; and 9 would result in less SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta than under the No Action Alternative (shown in Tables 5-6 and 5-9). However, SWP and CVP water |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | deliveries would continue under all alternatives. |
| 134 | 4 | How does California Water Fix help reduce reliance on Delta imports as mandated by the 2009 Delta Reform Act? | Under the range of alternatives considered in the EIR/S full contract amounts are not delivered in the majority of times to the SWP and CVP water contractors, as presented in Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Model Results, of the EIR/EIS. Long-term water deliveries to SWP and CVP water contractors located south of the Delta are lower under Alternatives 6, 7, and 8 as compared to the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative. The EIR/S and the Draft BDCP were prepared in a manner to comply with the 2009 Delta Reform Act, as described in Appendix 3I, BDCP Compliance with the 2009 Delta Reform Act, of the Final EIR/EIS.<br><br>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. 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 Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management). |
| 134 | 5 | The State Water Resources Control Board, the Department of Water Resources, and the Bureau of Reclamation have allowed for the waiving and weakening of Delta water quality standards for all water uses and species protections during the drought, endangering numerous Delta species and bringing some to the precipice of extinction. How can San Francisco Bay-Delta business, tourism, fishing, and farming communities trust the tunnels would be operated any better? | No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. |
| 134 | 6 | Isn't the majority of the habitat designated under California Eco Restore for mitigation for the 2008 biological opinions? Isn't that habitat for damage already done to the Delta? | The commenter is asking a question about California EcoRestore and its relationship to the 2008 Biological Opinions. EcoRestore does include implementation of the required mitigation for the State Water Project and Central Valley Project. California EcoRestore is unassociated with any of the proposed habitat restoration under Alternatives 2D, 4A, and 5A in the EIR/EIS but does include much of the BDCP conservation strategy presented in the HCP/NCCP alternatives. |
| 134 | 7 | How does a Delta tunnels-only project and less than 2000 acres of mitigation habitat comply with the 2009 Delta Reform Act "coequal goals" of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration while protecting the Delta as a place? | The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion I the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, turbidity and salinity the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project would also include habitat restoration to reduce effects on the water conveyance facility on listed species and has reduced many of the Delta footprint impacts, compared to other alternatives addressed in the EIR/EIS by constructing tunnels versus canals, rerouting the alignment to affect less private property and reduce effects on Staten Island to reduce effects on greater sandhill crane. In addition, the State is also implementing the California Delta EcoRestore program to restore up to 30,000 acres of Delta habitat. |
| 134 | 8 | If the North Delta diversions are better for fish, how much will the over overall "take" or "kill" numbers for endangered fish species be reduced? What can we expect in terms of reduction numbers? | The take authorization, if issued, will be included in the BiOp from NMFS and FWS and in the Incidental Take Permit from DFW. |
| 134 | 9 | Where does the water for the tunnels come from? What will that do to the source area? How long is it sustainable? Have you analyzed the economic and environmental impacts on those regions? | All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. Senior water rights holders are not affected by implementation of action alternatives. The CALSIM II model assumptions provide the same deliveries to senior water rights holders under the No Action Alternative and all action alternatives. As discussed in Chapter 5, Water Supply, |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | of the EIR/S, climate change, sea level rise, and population growth in the northern Delta watershed are anticipated to affect senior water rights holders (as shown in the comparison between the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative model runs) with or without implementation of the action alternatives. The EIR/EIS considers environmental impacts to source waters, e.g., in Chapter 11, upstream effects of reservoir operations are considered on a variety of fishes. Chapter 12 discusses the issue of upstream effects in Section 12.3 on page 12-134 of the Final EIR/EIS. |
| 134 | 10 | According to Dr. Jeff Michael of University of the Pacific, the estimated benefits for the project drop by $10 billion without regulatory assurance for water deliveries. How can farmers afford such costly water and hope to maintain a profit? How much of the project will urban ratepayers and property taxpayers Southern California and Silicon Valley pay for the project? | Please see Master Response 5 regarding costs of implementation and funding for the BDCP. As described in Impact ECON-6 under Alternative 4A in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, construction of conveyance facilities would convert land from existing agricultural uses to project-related construction uses, and agricultural land could also be affected by changes in water quality and other conditions that would affect crop productivity. These direct effects on agricultural land are described under Impacts AG-1 and AG-2 in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources. Total value of irrigated crop production in the Delta would decline on average by $5.3 million per year during the construction period, with total irrigated crop acreage declining by about 4,700 acres. Other effects related to production costs, travel time, and loss of investments in production facilities and standing orchards and vineyards would also occur as a result of facilities construction. When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the alternative. While the compensation to property owners would reduce the severity of economic effects related to the loss of agricultural land, it would not constitute mitigation for any related physical impact.<br><br>Under Alternative 4A, publicly-owned water conveyance facilities would be constructed on land of which some is currently held by private owners. Property tax and assessment revenue generated by lands that would be transferred from private to is estimated to total $6.7 million over the construction period. Typically, decreases in revenue could potentially result in the loss of a substantial share of some agencies' tax bases and particularly for smaller districts affected by a project. However, California Water Code (Section 85089 subdivision 9b) specifies that the entities constructing and operating a new Delta conveyance facility will fully mitigate for the loss of property tax revenues or assessments levied by local governments or special districts. This Water Code requirement will ensure that tax revenues forgone as a result of transferring land from private to public ownership will be fully offset. |
| 135 | 1 | I am writing to express my strong opposition to the California Water Fix (Alternative 4A). It is yet another plan that does not produce one new drop of water, which is the only viable solution to support millions of Californians and 3 million acres of farmland. Nor does it protect the Delta's fresh water, which already has been depleted by one-third and is threatening fisheries, recreational use, farmland, and clean air. I urge the Department of Water Resources and the Administration to reject the latest proposal. Save our Delta! | 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. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need). |
| 136 | 1 | Stop letting corporations take our water and sell for profit, and/or Frack it away. | 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.<br><br>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to 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, and is a lawful use of water. 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 |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | fracking regulations. Please see Master Response 34 for additional information regarding use of water delivered by proposed water conveyance facilities.<br><br>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.<br><br>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. |
| 137 | 1 | I am writing to express my strong opposition for the California Water Fix (Alternative 4A). It represents a costly, damaging plan to move water from the Sacramento River directly to the south and will destroy the natural environment in the Delta.<br><br>We urge the Department of Water Resources and the Administration to stop all action on the California Water Fix as quickly as possible. | 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. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. |
| 137 | 2 | Our state's system of relying totally on the Delta and moving too much water from the Delta through aqueducts and pipes to bring water from the Sierra Nevada Mountains to the South needs to be changed and add more modern desalination, recycling, ground water recharge, and better conservation to the mix. Note - there is no issue with the current water supply even in the event of a major earthquake or flood - that's the "Earthquake Bogey" thought up after Katrina but proven not applicable to the Delta. We must stop destroying the Delta. | 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. Please also see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7 regarding desalination, and Master Response 6 regarding demand management. |
| 137 | 3 | The California Water Fix (Alternative 4A) is the culmination of nearly a decade of wasted money, resulting in no value. It has been extremely time consuming for the public, as shown by the unprecedented public comment and participation. Even with the public's inputs, the basis of the plan never changes and keeps planning for a terrible 10-14 year construction project right through the heart of the Delta destroying the Delta's scenic beauty, value for recreation and boating, fresh water for Delta farms and communities. It reflects absolute rejection of the Delta communities' inputs and the inputs from the rest of Northern Californians and any environmentalist who wants a pure and healthy Delta, salmon runs, and clean San Francisco Bay. | The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 for more information on the purpose and need for the proposed project.<br><br>Resource areas are addressed separately in the EIR/EIS 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, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments and mitigation measures will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible.<br><br>Please refer to Chapter 32 of the Final EIR/EIS and Master Response 40 for information regarding outreach conducted for California WaterFix (and previously the BDCP) and Master Response 24 regarding the Delta as A Place. |
| 137 | 4 | The California Water Fix will do nothing to upgrade the levees. If the state truly believed there was a risk of earthquakes and natural disasters, they would do something to protect the people who live here from death by flooding. Obviously there is no real concern of earthquakes and natural disasters causing the levees to fall down and the communities in the Delta to flood. | Please see Chapter 2, FEIR/EIS, for the BDCP/CWF purpose and need, and Appendix 6A Sections 6A.2 and 6A.3 for discussion on existing levee improvement programs and funding mechanisms, which would not be affected by the BDCP/CWF. Levees are an important public safety resource and the proposed project would not change levee policy or replace ongoing programs and grant projects aimed at facilitating and supporting levee improvements in or outside the Delta. It recognized that levee maintenance and safety in the Delta is |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | an important issue for the residents of the Delta and for statewide interests. |
| 137 | 5 | Getting to this point has been a long and torturous process. The time to act and move forward is now to stop threatening the property and happiness of the Northern California citizens and find true solutions for California's water. In the meantime, we must balance the amount of farming that can be done in the Central Valley desert with the true amount of water available before desal and other water-producing efforts can be brought on-line. We also need to limit expansion of housing to meet the water needs. The system is in crisis and a total collapse will ruin the entire state's economy in a real way.<br><br>While the state re-plans for desalination and other true solutions, I call for the state to quickly balance the water need with available water by retiring Westlands acreage in the desert, stopping the spread of almonds throughout the Central Valley, and halting new developments in L.A. until a true, state-wide water solution is identified. | 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. Please also see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed and Master Response 7 regarding desalination. For more information regarding demand management please see Master Response 6. |
| 137 | 6 | I strongly oppose the California Water Fix and call for the state to drop the plan immediately. | No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. |
| 138 | 1 | [I would] recommend a state-wide standardization of water rates to prevent price-gouging by local districts and price-breaks for those who have consistently been among the most conservation-minded, using the least water and using it more efficiently. The tiered system is inequitable when (in the case of my local water district, the EVMWD) they institute a 27% increase for Tier 1 (lowest usage) only, (regardless of conservation) but no across-the-board increase for the more extensive-use levels. This is unfair, targeting those who can least afford it while leaving the rates the same for those who are heavier users and wouldn't have as much trouble dealing with their bill. Sound familiar? | 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.<br><br>The commenter does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. |
| 142 | 1 | Building these tunnels would be a big waste of money and not accomplish anything to end our water problems.<br><br>The only thing it would accomplish would be to send more water from the Delta to Southern California therefore causing more brackish water from the Bay to go further up the Delta where there is now freshwater. It would be an environmental disaster.<br><br>Let's learn how to recycle our water and use gray water where appropriate. We have a Space Station orbiting the Earth that doesn't have fresh water piped up to it in big tunnels, yet they are doing just fine. Let's use our modern technology to solve our water problems instead of Gold Rush era technology. | 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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, and Master Response 14 regarding salinity |
| 145 | 1 | This is a boondoggle plain and simple and you want taxpayers to foot the bill. Who will benefit? The crony capitalists that donated money to Jerry Brown. You refuse to build water storage and desalination plants or properly capture the rainwater flowing into the ocean. Yet you want to stick taxpayers with this project that creates no water, will destroy the Delta and cause saltwater intrusion, and will cost $67 billion. Shame on you. | 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.<br><br>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility.<br><br>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project, 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. |
| 147 | 1 | Are certain amounts of water from these projects earmarked for certain corporations or industry? Where does this water come from and what impacts will they have on the region? I heard that Paramount Farming (Paramount) will receive a huge sum of these resources for their farms in Kern County. These farms are retired oil fields and in a 2003 L.A. Times article, it was shown that Paramount privatized a state-owned resource. Could the same be said for the California Water Fix (CWF)?<br><br>Also, as a publicly funded project, costing $67 billion of ratepayer money, I am concerned that this project is not clearly laid out for common citizens that are now aware of water policy and politics. Given the context of a corporate agribusiness privatizing state resources in the past, I am concerned the same could happen for the CWF.<br><br>There needs to be a solid assessment of the water, in adjudicating and knowing what makes sense statewide. | 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. The issue water use is beyond the scope of the proposed project. Contractors and their customers must make economic decisions about planting in light of the amounts of water they are likely to receive going forward. With regards to beneficial use of water, please see Master Response 34.<br><br>The construction of the water delivery facilities is estimated to cost $14.9 billion, an amount that would be paid for by the state and federal water contractors who rely on Delta exports. The range of costs for water vary widely among contractors south of the Delta. Costs depend on the source of water, transport facilities, energy requirements, among other factors. For the agricultural customers of the CVP, prices range from $100 per acre-foot to more than $400 per acre-foot. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, which buys water from the SWP, estimates that the cost of the proposed project would translate into about $5.00 extra per household, per month in its service area. The final cost of water from the new conveyance facilities would be determined by numerous factors. A number of these significant factors, such as the project yield and allocation of costs, have yet to be determined. Please see Master Response 5 for information regarding funding of the proposed project. |
| 148 | 1 | I do not support this plan. Dams, tunnels, and man-made structures do not always work. We need to work with natural ecosystem flow, instead of against it. Think of waterways as veins of blod in our bodies. I support a more holistic approach.<br><br>We are already in a drought. This water plan Brown proposes does not taken into consideration destructive ecosystem impacts. If southern California has billions of dollars to invest in Hollywood, they should be that invested in the maintenance and care of their natural ecosystems and water. We cannot afford this. | The proposed project is one aspect of the ways in which the state is planning to meet water demands. 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.<br><br>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/.<br><br>Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding), respectively. |
| 149 | 1 | It is my understanding that on December 30th 2009 EPA issued an "Action Plan" where they raise awareness of 4 major chemicals that are currently affecting our public health and environment. One of these chemicals is Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (aka DEHP). In the old and currently updated EIR/EIS there is no specific reference to this phthalate. It is also my understanding that not a lot of research is done on this toxic plasticizer that has the potential to affect the endocrine system of humans. It also fails to assess the effects of this chemical or any other toxic chemicals on any wildlife. If these chemicals affect us and we just drink it, imagine living in a toxic environment--that's what the fish are facing. | While bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (DEHP) has been detected in wastewater discharges, its presence in the ambient surface waters at concentrations near or exceeding applicable criteria has not been established. Many detections in wastewater effluents have attributed to sample contamination, and have been reduced or eliminated through implementation of improved, clean sample collection techniques. Thus, past data from wastewater treatment plants prior to implementation of clean sample collection techniques cannot be considered reliable. The ambient receiving water data sets that were used to conduct the Screening Analysis did not contain data for DEHP. However, phthalates, as a class of constituents that are of emerging concern, were addressed, as noted in the comment. ECs and CECs as a class of constituents were fully assessed via reference and discussion to applicable literature, even though measurements of these |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | constituents were not found in the screening data sets used. In general, it is not the case that the screening data sets included all of the information used to make determinations of whether to carry forward a constituent or not, and neither was it used to assess the constituents themselves. The screening datasets merely served as one tool with which to evaluate constituents that should be carried forward.<br><br>Finally, the focus of the discussion in Appendix 8C is on factors that would be affected by the project, specifically changing proportions of river inflows into the Delta. There is insufficient science and evidence to conclude that changes due to the project would have a significant impact on CECs. |
| 149 | 2 | These documents, before this open house were extremely difficult to access and I'm an academic.<br><br>Imagine the rest of the public, how will they access only parts of the old and new EIR & EIS are available to the public [sic]. | The commenter does not provide specific reasons why the documents were difficult to access. As state agencies, the Department of Water Resources and the California Natural Resources Agencies have an obligation to provide the public with educational information that is rooted in fact, based on reasonable assumptions supported by facts and expert opinions substantiated by facts. Doing so for a project of large scale and complexity can be a challenge. The BDCP website, blog, Your Questions Answered, and social media platforms have been the primary vehicle for communicating important project information and correcting misinformation. Brochures, factsheets, webinars and videos are other tools the State has employed to educate the public about the proposed BDCP and the EIR/EIS process. Representatives from the State have also held numerous meetings and briefings around the state to educate stakeholders and provide them with critical information about project developments and the EIR/EIS process. Brochures, factsheets, webinars, reports and other information is kept on the project website, www.BayDeltaConservationPlan.com and is available for review. Historical materials remain available for review and are labeled as achieved or superseded. For more information on the public outreach efforts made during the BDCP and EIR/EIS process, please see Master Response 40.<br><br>More information on how DWR has developed the project in an open and transparent manner is provided in Master Response 41.<br><br>For more information regarding the document's length and complexity please see Master Response 38. |
| 150 | 1 | As a whitewater paddler, I spend a considerable amount of time on the river. Because of the lack of free-flowing rivers, my only option during most times of the year is dam release. I see first-hand that our water supply is dwindling.<br><br>This project is to have a more reliable transfer of water through the Delta. What water? We really do not, and will not, have more water in the future. We are in a "new normal" or what we call a drought. Our focus needs to be on a better way to use the water we do have.<br><br>Educate people about where it comes from and that it is not limited to a finite resource. Save the Delta for the use Mother Nature intended. | In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal and State regulating agencies, ESA compliance, and project design. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.<br><br>Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease 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 exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods. |
| 151 | 1 | No clean explanation of how the Fix is to be financed had been provided. No reasonable bond lender should provide long term financing based on a 10-year (short term) project | DWR and the participating state and federal water contractors are preparing a financing plan for the proposed action separately from the environmental review process. A financing plan is not required to be |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | permit. Water contractors cannot pay for a (canal) tunnel with short-term money. There is no cost benefit study. | part of the BDCP (Alternative 4) or the proposed action (Alternative 4A) as described in the RDEIR/SDEIS. |
| 151 | 2 | How does taking 9,000 cubic feet per second of the best water from the top of the Delta benefit anyone south of the diversion point? Fish, farming, and recreation all suffer when water quality degrades.<br><br>What is true rationale for diversion of the “best” water quality available and shifting it through tunnels to contractors with junior water rights south of the Delta? | No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised. |
| 151 | 3 | No serious evaluation of a “West Delta” diversion plan is included in your EIR/EIS. | Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives) and Master Response 37 (Storage) for additional information regarding why the West Delta diversion plan is beyond the purpose and scope of the proposed project. |
| 151 | 4 | How do you plan to comply with the “Clean Water Act” by diverting water from north end of the Delta? | The EIR/EIS alternatives assume continued operations in accordance with the federal Clean Water Act (as regulated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, State Water Resources Control Board, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers). The action alternatives include existing methods to achieve some of the existing criteria under existing operations, plus alternative methods to meet the regulatory objectives. |
| 151 | 5 | Delta residents are very skeptical that water quality standards will be maintained. Previous promises have been broken numerous times. | No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised. |
| 152 | 1 | I have lived on the Delta near Bethel Island for 42 years. I have seen the continuing problems resulting from sending so much water south. This plan to take it before it even reaches us is ludicrous. Now the Brown administration and big money almond growers have taken the 50-year guarantee to restore the Delta’s environment off the table. To call the original project the "Bay Delta Conservation Plan" was a lie in itself, but now calling it "California Water Fix" is total fabrication in an effort to again mislead the people.<br><br>Governor Brown has lied long enough. California voted down these tunnels years ago, and if the truth were let out, they would impeach the politicians that sold us a multibillion dollar lie. It will not fix California’s water problems! | The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. 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. |
| 152 | 2 | Thousands of people need the Delta to make a living, to enjoy, to drink, to water our crops, and to enjoy a waterfront view. Without safeguards, I feel the Delta as we know it will not survive. | The Lead Agencies discuss community character in Chapter 16 of the EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A (Socioeconomics) identifies the unique features of the Delta and describes the potential effects on Delta communities. Please see chapter 15 for a discussion on impacts to recreation. Impacts to agriculture are identified and discussed in Chapter 14; project proponents have proposed measures that would support and protect agricultural production in the Delta by securing agricultural easements and/or by seeking opportunities to protect and enhance agriculture with a focus on maintaining economic activity on agricultural lands. Please see Master Response 18 for more information on agricultural mitigation. |
| 153 | 1 | Why, in a period of increasing drought, are we seriously considering sending scare water out of this parched region? I understand that water exports to Southern California are planned not to exceed 10% of current exports, but with reduced overall available resources, it seems to me that the current canal system would be adequate to handle 10% of the generally reduced total. | No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Water delivered to the SWP and CVP water contractors participating in proposed project would be within the existing contract amounts to serve agricultural lands that have been cultivated and existing and planned community populations. As shown in Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Model Results, of the EIR/EIS, the north Delta intake tunnels would not be fully utilized except for periods of time when the Sacramento River flows are higher than in drought years. As described in Chapter 5, Water Supply, of the EIR/S, it is anticipated that climate change would result in more frequent and more severe rainfall events and less snowfall than under historic conditions. These rainfall events would result in periods of time when the capacity of the existing intakes would not be adequate. Therefore, the proposed project would provide the maximum capacity in the intakes and tunnels during those periods of time to convey water during |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | extremely wet periods to areas south of the Delta for storage and use during drier times.<br><br>The proposed project also was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. |
| 153 | 2 | Two DWR representatives this afternoon have explained that the new northern diversion won't be used until flow capacity is higher than it has been, this year or last. Both added that climate projections are uncertain and that high and low years can be modelled, making the northern diversion useful. So in the low years it will be idle. And as low years increase in number, as can also be modelled, the northern diversion will be less and less used. It sure seems as though the current canal system could handle a future of more or less water diversions. | As shown in Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Model Results, of the EIR/EIS, the north Delta intake tunnels would not be fully utilized except for a few months in wet years. However, it is important to have the maximum capacity in the intakes and tunnels during those periods of time to convey water during extremely wet periods to areas south of the Delta for storage and use during drier times. The north Delta intakes would have minimal flows that would be required for maintenance of the pumps during critical dry years.<br><br>The proposed project also was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. |
| 153 | 3 | Problems with the current pumps and screens? Spend a billion fixing them, then. Not the "do nothing" alternative, but one that improves the current system at far less expense and environmental disruption/constructions and one that fits with a drier future in which there will surely be less water to divert. | No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.<br><br>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 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. |
| 153 | 4 | There won't be enough water in the future to meet existing desires and needs. Diverting the water we have won't be enough of a solution to the water demands. Many solutions are needed, including conservation, drought tolerant planting, rainwater retention, building code revisions, etc. There are currently many efforts to these ends, but they are really few and far between -- too few to make the difference needed.<br><br>It doesn't make sense to me to put the time, effort, and money into development of the tunnels plan and construction before enforced development of all the other measures that will help meet water needs.<br><br>What plan ties all of these measures together in a meaningful way? The governor has a water plan, but it isn't the document we need. L.A. could trap far more rainwater than they do, for e.g. Why isn't there a plan that requires this first, before tunnel expenditures? Or a plan that requires entirely drought tolerant planting at all public buildings? Because enforcement of such a plan would be difficult and no reason to throw it out in favor of | Although conservation components 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 BDCP or California WaterFix. 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, rainwater retention, code revisions, or other measures to conserve water or expand supply and storage. For more information regarding demand management please see Master Response 6. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3. |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | tearing up the Delta and sending water south. That will be difficult! | |
| 153 | 5 | I've learned from some of the experts in this format (open house), but their answers didn't go out to others, except for other individuals who asked similar questions. So many more people could learn the answers to the same questions if this meeting were held as a hearing. What purpose does an open house format serve the people? | The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. For more information on the public outreach efforts made during the BDCP and EIR/EIS process, please see Chapter 32 of the EIR/EIS and Master Response 40. For additional information about how this project has been developed in an open and transparent manner, please refer to Master Response 41. |
| 154 | 1 | I submit this comment with deep concern over the project's potential to exacerbate the negative consequences of California's drought upon farmers and ecosystems. The current historic drought is the most severe in 1200 years; the tunnel construction over a 14-year period, regardless of its eventual capacity to mitigate drought consequences, does not address communities' urgent need for water this year.<br><br>Without regulatory assurance for water deliveries, the project's estimated benefits drop by $10 billion [Dr. J Michael, University of the Pacific]. This figure poses a significant challenge to farmers already handling water scarcity, who must pay the price for such costly water.<br><br>I encourage lead agencies to account for the economic and ecosystem impacts of the project in the Final EIR, and these impacts should make clear that the project devastates both. I firmly oppose the tunnels. | 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. 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 with continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).<br><br>Please refer to Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, Impacts ECON-6, 12, and 18 for Alternative 4A regarding agricultural economics. Please also refer to Impact ECON-19 regarding socioeconomic effects in the South-of-Delta hydrologic regions: the operational components of the proposed water conveyance facilities could result in a number of socioeconomic effects in areas receiving SWP and CVP water deliveries outside of the Delta. |
| 155 | 1 | Governor Brown 50 years ago had a revolutionary plan to dam all along the Eel River, pump the water upstream, and send it to southern California. It never happened, just too wild and crazy an idea. Great concept, create water from wasted floods and use it for California people. It failed, but we still remember that Governor (Edmund G. "Pat") Brown.<br><br>Now a new Governor Brown proposes the Delta tunnel that creates no water and just wastes it to try to grow nuts where no nuts should grow and ship them to China. Completely crazy idea. Governor Brown, we remember your father even without his water plan. We'll remember you, too, even without [these] completely crazy twin tunnels. | The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. 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. |
| 156 | 1 | I direct my comments to the political leaders of my residence state, California.<br><br>I ask, on behalf of families everywhere, and in particular, my 2 granddaughters, members of the coming generation--this question(s):<br><br>1. When will you listen to and hear the voice of the people? When will you return to integrity in your representation of every concerned citizen of CA? Your allegiance is to us, not the leaders of profit-driven businesses.<br><br>2. How can I defend you to my grand-children who ask me why our leaders are not more careful with our planet and our environment?<br><br>Please walk back onto the path of integrity and goodwill towards people and the land we live upon. | 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. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please refer to Master Response 40 (Public Outreach Adequacy), Master Response 41 (Transparency), Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), and Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use Of Water). |
| 157 | 1 | Millions, if not billions, have been wasted on bureaucratic job fulfillment. If all that wasted money were spent on true fixes, we would not be in this predicament. Let these many talented Cal Fix planners, scientists, to work on real, long-term solutions that will provide jobs for many more years than tunnel construction. | No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised. 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 |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | reliability of exported supplies and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. |
| 157 | 2 | Comprehensive, state-wide conservation programs:<br><br>- Low-flow toilets in every household.<br><br>- Storm water recapture infrastructure upgrades to contain pipe leakage.<br><br>- Upgrade water recycling processes.<br><br>- Follow unproductive, toxic farm land, etc. | The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Although conservation components 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 BDCP or California WaterFix. It is important to note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a statewide 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, water recycling, etc. |
| 158 | 1 | Considering the ambiguity in the actual impact on the Delta environment, based on the lack of exact scientific data as noted in the SDEIS, the use of desalinization should be thoroughly studied for its viability, with the study released for review and comment by the public as part of California WaterFix, prior to permit application. Blatantly, it appears that desalinization was not given consideration, inexplicably, by DWR. Salt water is at least as close to Clifton Court Forebay as is the tunnel intake near Clarksburg.<br><br>The desalinization process would not involve the risk to the Detla environment, and technology backed by scientifc data exists to calculate and successfully mitigate the environmental impact cause by a desalinization facility.<br><br>The cost of desalinization can be apportioned among those public and private entities that would benefit from the water. The private share of the cost could be temporarily subsidized by bonds, with the retirement cost paid by private interests as their revenue was generated by/related to the increased water. | 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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.<br><br>Please see Master Response 7 regarding desalination. |
| 159 | 1 | Consider: take your $50 billion and create water storage/water creation rather than disruptive tunnels. Why no real consideration in your plan? | While water storage is a critically important tool for managing California's water resources, it is not a topic that must be addressed in the EIR/EIS for the proposed project. This is because the proposed project does not, and need not, propose storage as a project component. Although the physical facilities contemplated by the proposed project once up and running would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, the proposed project is a stand-alone project for purposes of CEQA and NEPA, just as future storage projects would be. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, of the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage. Please see Master Response 37 regarding water storage. |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Please also refer to Master Response 3 for information on the purpose and need for the project. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. 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. |
| 160 | 1 | Well, the BDCP is in no way a Delta conservation plan. It is a destruction plan. I don't understand how anyone could think that pumping more fresh water away from the Delta would or could conserve or improve the Delta's ecosytem. Anyone that believes that to be true is too stupid to argue with. This plan is just a revision of Jerry Brown's Peripheral Canal plan that was soundly defeated by the voters during his last term as governor. The only difference is the exponential cost increase, and the financiers such as the Metropolitan Water District, along with Mr. Stewart Resnick, all of whom have no qualms about destroying the Delta as long as they get its water. Remember Owens Valley? That is what this plan will do to our precious Delta. I've lived here for fifty years and have seen the impact of our water going south! | 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, 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 44 (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.<br><br>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<br><br>Refer to Master Response 5 (Cost of Implementation, Funding Sources), Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply) and Master Response 36 (Peripheral Canal). |
| 161 | 1 | Much of the farm land in the Lower San Joaquin Valley is of low quality and some is selenium leadened. Why is this poor quality farmland being given water that is presently being used for fisheries farming and to prevent saltwater intrusion? Is there more water going to be produced by this project? If not, who will lose water?<br><br>Presently, is there more water allocated from the California water projects than exists?<br><br>How can this be explained? | For information about purpose and need of this project, please see Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need.<br><br>The preferred alternative, Alternative 4A, 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 preferred alternative 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 preferred alternative).<br><br>The EIR/S does not evaluate effects to water rights. Water rights are the responsibility of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). The SWRCB must issue a permit to this project to change the point of diversion. |
| 162 | 1 | No one has successfully convinced me that preventing water from flowing through the Delta will save it. Any excess water not needed to preserve a working Delta and its wildlife has to be taken after it has gone through the Delta. Use state of the art fish screens before using | This comment is on the merits of the project. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | fish kills today as an excuse for the tunnels. You cannot preserve the Delta by taking a decade and a half to trash it, digging giant holes into and under it. You know the cost will triple. The likelihood is that there won't be extra water to move to the south by the time it's completed, anyway. If the politcally more powerful southern California ends up getting to take the water then just build an above-ground pipe to move it - do not dig up the Delta! | 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), Master Response 5 (Cost), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply). |
| 163 | 1 | This project is so expensive to go through. Who is going to pay it? And who is going to benefit? I don't want our scarce water to be used to irrigate desert lands to produce almonds and pistachios. We don't need almonds to live but we do need water. | In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. |
| 163 | 2 | The RDEIR is not user friendly at all. I have been trying to read it for 3 weeks, but I guess it was prepared not for public but for some kind of computers! It's 44,000 pages in total and you want us to read it in 3 months as well as to write comments in the same period. | The proposed project and the draft BDCD are very complex. The Lead Agencies have attempted to present the analysis in the EIR/EIS in a clear format with an emphasis on information that is useful to the public, agencies, and decision makers. Recognizing the length and complexity of the Draft EIR/EIS, the Lead Agencies took numerous steps to make the information accessible and understandable. The Lead Agencies posted online documents highlighting important aspects of the BDCP and the EIR/EIS. They produced 17 narrated informational webinar episodes regarding the BDCP and EIR/EIS that were available online, and they distributed factsheets throughout the comment period. In addition, both the BDCP and EIR/EIS contain executive summaries, and the most complex EIR/EIS chapters contain reader guides. For the RDEIR/SDEIS, the Lead Agencies provided a summary of revisions. Chapter 1 of the RDEIR/SDEIS describes the contents of the document and provides references to the locations where readers may find specific discussions and analyses. For more information regarding document length and complexity, please see Master Response 38. For a discussion of the public comment period, see Master Response 39. |
| 163 | 3 | I am very concerned about methyl mercury. We all know the health impacts of this toxic chemical yet there is no mitigation and environmental measure to avoid and decrease the amount in the Delta. Environmental Commitment 12 is not sufficient to decrase the amount of methyl mercury. We are faced with serious health impacts. Public health is more important than pistachios! | Impacts to mercury and methyl mercury were addressed for all project alternatives in Chapter 8, Water Quality, Impacts WQ-13 and WQ-14. |
| 164 | 1 | The DWR and joint agencies hosted an open house on the BDCP in Sacramento on July 28. I have two questions:<br><br>Why were Department of Homeland Security Officers present at this event?<br><br>When will the DWR and US Bureau of Reclamation management be at an event where the public can provide comment? | DWR and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation implemented standard security measures for the public meetings held in July on the RDEIR/SDEIS. Numerous DWR and Reclamation staff were available at the July 2015 public open house meetings to discuss the RDEIR/SDEIS and answer questions about the document. |
| 165 | 1 | I want a forum to hear all of the thoughts people have about this Fix. | The commenter raises an issue related to public information and transparency. As state agencies, the Department of Water Resources and the California Natural Resources Agencies have an obligation to provide the public with educational information that is rooted in fact, based on reasonable assumptions supported by facts and expert opinions substantiated by facts. Doing so for a project of large scale and complexity can be a challenge. The BDCP website, blog, Your Questions Answered, and social media platforms have been the primary vehicle for communicating important project information and correcting misinformation. Brochures, factsheets, webinars and videos are other tools the State has employed to educate the public about the proposed BDCP and the EIR/EIS process. Representatives from the State have also held numerous meetings and briefings around the state to educate stakeholders and provide them with critical information |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | about project developments and the EIR/EIS process. Brochures, factsheets, webinars, reports and other information is kept on the project website, www.BayDeltaConservationPlan.com and is available for review. Historical materials remain available for review and are labeled as achieved or superseded. For more information on the public outreach efforts made during the BDCP and EIR/EIS process, please see Chapter 32 of the EIR/EIS and Master Response 40. For additional information about how this project has been developed in an open and transparent manner, please refer to Master Response 41. |
| 165 | 2 | Fix the levees; fix the pump; do not break ground on this expensive, unnecessary project.<br><br>The money being spent on this project should be used to give homeowners information on how to conserve water. There should be rebate program for everything! Lawns should be discouraged. | The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns while securing reliable water deliveries. Appendix 1C of the Final EIR/EIS, Demand Management Measures, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. Refer to Master Response 6 for more information on demand management. Although components such as demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the State, they are beyond the scope of the project. Refer also to Appendix 6A (BDCP/California WaterFix Coordination with Flood Management Requirements). |
| 166 | 1 | This entire RDEIR/SDEIS does not address economics. I am concerned that water users (residential/commercial/agricultural) will not be able to bear the increased costs of $10 billion without regulatory assurance for water deliveries according to Dr. Jeff Michael of the University of the Pacific. | Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, addresses many potential socioeconomic impacts. Please see Master Response 5 regarding costs of the project. |
| 166 | 2 | Chapter 11 and the mitigation measures for fish and aquatic species for all alternatives listed in the RDEIR/SDEIS do not appear to lower "take" or "kill" numbers for endangered fish. Please explain/clarify. This is like closing the barn door after the horse got out. ES-48 states there is no feasible mitigation to address "this impact on Chinook salmon" [According to Under Potential Impact AQUA-NAA4: Effects of water operations on spawning and egg incubation habitat for covered fish species]. | NAA is one of several alternative evaluated and, like several alternatives, is expected to cause adverse effects and/or significant impacts. However, no adverse effects/significant impacts on fish and aquatic species are predicted from implementation of the preferred Alternative 4A. Furthermore, the lead agencies are not required to mitigate impacts under a no project scenario. Please see Chapter 11 for more information. |
| 167 | 1 | Will the state conduct a full cost-benefit analysis of the project that includes the value of freshwater to the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary?<br><br>In the context of water quality, Chapter 8 "Water Quality" of the Draft EIR/EIS has updated per the July 2015 revision, is unclear as to the value of the freshwater to the San Francisco Bay-delta estuary environment [sic]. | DWR is preparing a revised but more limited cost-benefit analysis for the current proposed project (Alternative 4A) and to support project financing and implementation. In contrast to the former Statewide Economic Impact Report, the new analysis will be limited to the economic benefits related to water supply, water quality, and water supply reliability. The economic benefits of the habitat restoration will not be included in the new cost-benefit analysis because the amount of habitat restoration required for mitigation is substantially less than the restoration that was originally proposed under BDCP. This updated cost-benefit analysis is not needed to support the final EIR/EIS or the Lead Agency decisions associated with CEQA or NEPA compliance but it is expected to be released prior to the final decisions on the project. Please also note that the Statewide Economic Impact Report is not a part of this EIR/EIS. |
| 167 | 2 | It is not clear from the revised sec 4 of the RDIR/SDEIS documents how much water will be available for export during a drought after prior water rights and public trust needs are met. If there isn't any water, how often will the tunnels be dry [sic]. Drought is not temporary, it is cyclical and worsened by climate change. | The total amount of water exported by month in each water year type for each action alternative is presented in Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Model Results, of the EIR/EIS. As shown in Appendix 5A, the north Delta intake tunnels would not be fully utilized except for a few months in wet years. However, it is important to have the maximum capacity in the intakes and tunnels during those periods of time to convey water during extremely wet periods to areas south of the Delta for storage and use during drier times. The north Delta intakes would have minimal flows that would be required for maintenance of the pumps during critical dry years.<br><br>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. The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change with continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management). |
| 168 | 1 | Pg ES-48 - Potential Impact:<br><br>AQUA-NAA4: Effects of water operations on spawning and egg incubation habitat for covered fish species:<br><br>Comment: This is unacceptable. You state there is no mitigation to address the impact of water operations on spawning and egg incubation habitat for covered species. Please explain how this is environmentally sound. | CEQA requires that mitigation be proposed to lessen significant impacts where it is feasible to do so. NEPA anticipates that mitigation will be provided for the impacts of a project where it is feasible to do so, regardless of whether or not there is an adverse effect. Under both laws, the purpose of mitigation is to lessen the effects of the proposed project or alternative being analyzed. In the case of the No Action Alternative scenario, there is no action being implemented by the project proponent—therefore the project proponent would not be responsible for mitigating any adverse impacts or effects that would occur in the case of the No Action Alternative scenario. |
| 169 | 1 | It is not clear from 2.4 Revised Project Description and Enhanced Level of Detail and E.S. 3.5 how the new and improved revisions will reduce reliance on delta imports as mandated by the 2009 Delta Reform Act. Please clarify. | Under the range of alternatives considered in the EIR/S full contract amounts are not delivered in the majority of times to the SWP and CVP water contractors, as presented in Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Model Results, of the EIR/EIS. Long-term water deliveries to SWP and CVP water contractors located south of the Delta are lower under Alternatives 6, 7, and 8 as compared to the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative. The EIR/S and the Draft BDCP were prepared in a manner to comply with the 2009 Delta Reform Act, as described in Appendix 3I, BDCP Compliance with the 2009 Delta Reform Act, of the Final EIR/EIS.<br><br>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. 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 Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management). |
| 169 | 2 | Chapter 11, Chapter 12, & Chapter 15-Recreation<br><br>With respect to the current "water fix" document, please show me where I can trust that water quality standards and species protection during drought will be operated equal to or better than the current wauiening [sic] and weakening of delta water standards for all users and species protection. | 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.<br><br>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. |
| 170 | 1 | It is not clear from ES.1.2.2.1, Project Objectives, or the additional project objectives of Section 1.1.4.1 of the RDEIS/SDEIS whether or not this Delta tunnels-only project, with less than 2,000 acres of mitigation habitat, will comply with the 2009 Delta Reform Act's "co-equal goals" of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration, while protecting the Delta as a place. Please clarify. | 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.<br><br>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | purpose and need behind the proposed project.<br><br>For more information regarding the proposed project's compliance with the Delta Reform Act please see Master Response 31. For more information regarding preserving the Delta as a Place please see Master Response 24. |
| 171 | 1 | Why is there no discussion about the alternative of retirement of agricultural land in the southern San Joaquin Valley? The tunnels will deliver water to those unsustainable lands with the short-term affect of enriching a few producers of agricultural products for export, but with the long-term cumulative affect of soil toxicity that will render those lands non-productive for agriculture and likely becoming hazardous to wildlife. | 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 the proposed conveyance facilities. |
| 172 | 1 | It is not clear from either the project descriptio, or the discussion of water supply impacts of the RDEIR/SDEIS alternatives, from where the project will derive water to put into the tunnels; what impacts will be to the source area; what the economic and environmental impacts will be on these regions; and how long the source water supply will be sustainable. Please clarify. | All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. Senior water rights holders are not affected by implementation of action alternatives. The CALSIM II model assumptions provide the same deliveries to senior water rights holders under the No Action Alternative and all action alternatives. As discussed in Chapter 5, Water Supply, of the EIR/S, climate change, sea level rise, and population growth in the northern Delta watershed are anticipated to affect senior water rights holders (as shown in the comparison between the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative model runs) with or without implementation of the action alternatives. The EIR/EIS considers environmental impacts to source waters, e.g., in Chapter 11, upstream effects of reservoir operations are considered on a variety of fishes. Chapter 12 discusses the issue of upstream effects in Section 12.3 on page 12-134 of the Final EIR/EIS. |
| 173 | 1 | Stop the tunnels! Save the Delta! | No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised. |
| 174 | 1 | I think the tunnels should not be built because the money would be better used fixing our levees that need to be fixed.<br><br>The best way to not need the tunnels is by water conservation this time especially in drought years like this year. | 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. 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. |
| 175 | 1 | I am very concerned about the control/diversion of water through this very fragile ecosystem. The investment in greater storage is a greater need in my opinion. In wet years we move water through the system, with no increase in upstream storage. In dry years water is released based on storm patterns and predictions that do not happen. | No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. 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 by conveying more water in the wet years and reducing water exports in the dry years, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply.<br><br>Future reservoir projects are still undergoing evaluation or review, including potential reservoir projects. Therefore, potential reservoir projects are only considered in the EIR/S as cumulative impact projects (please see Master Response 37). 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. |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| 175 | 2 | The impacts from construction and loss of farm land is another concern. Tunneling, depositing the spoils, for a project of this size, there will be negative impact to the environment. | The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Construction-related impacts are disclosed in individual resource area chapters in the EIR/EIS. All impacts would be minimized and mitigated to the degree feasible, as noted under each alternative in the EIR/EIS individual resource chapters and in Appendix 3B (Environmental Commitments) of the EIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 12 (Reusable Tunnel Material). |
| 175 | 3 | Cost is an issue. This is a water grab by the south state. The north state has suffered in drought, and water for farming in the south is mainly what this project is about. Why not increase dams in the south? | 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. For information regarding why water storage was not included in the proposed project, refer to Master Response 37 (Water Storage) and Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 35 (Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply). |
| 176 | 1 | It is vital that the twin tunnels not be built. That would prevent the fresh water from flowing through the Delta. There is already increased over-pumping taking place. That has a negative impact on the ecosystem. I am 67 years old, and have fished and hunted all of my life. I have seen the decline in salmon, striped bass, and waterfowl due to brackish water replacing fresh water. The Delta is a nursery and microorganisms, and some baitfish (Delta smelt), cannot tolerate increased salinity. Salty water kills the bottom of the food chain. Deep into a drought, it would be crazy to go forward with this plan. | In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal and State regulating agencies, ESA compliance, and project design. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease 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 exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods to improve ecosystem conditions in the Delta. |
| 176 | 2 | This project will only benefit a handful of wealthy corporations (Paramount Farms), who only want more water to grow more almonds in the southern California desert area, to make more profit exporting almonds to China. Politics and corporate money cannot be trusted to limit water taken. Increased pumping is already taking place in the Delta, sending water south. No Jerry! | The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. |
| 177 | 1 | If this is all about the plan that drains the Delta, there seems to be a huge group of living things missing from the presentations--the animals! Is there no concern for the animals? Do you really believe the animals will not be negatively impacted? | The lead agencies disagree that project effects on animals have been ignored. Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect wildlife species. The Chapter describes the impacts, both negative and positive, and discusses the mitigation measures and avoidance and minimization measures proposed to avoid, minimize, and compensate for any significant impacts. |
| 178 | 1 | As a home owner and voter in the area directly affected by the tunnels, I want to record that I am opposed to the plan "California Water Fix." The permanent and devastating effects of the tunnels will destroy our delta estuary. | The comment objects to the California Water Fix effects associated with the habitat and ecosystem. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the Clean Water Act as well as federal and state Endangered Species Acts; 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 |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | The habitat and ecosystems will change forever the wildlife that live here. The water flow southwest of the tunnels will dry up my hometown of Antioch and Walnut Grove. Our river will be transformed from a grand freshwater delta to a salty shallow bay.<br><br>This "Water Fix" is wrong. It is the single most devastating ecological disaster in the history of California. | 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).<br><br>To summarize changes in Delta outflow under Alternative 4A, late-fall and winter outflows remain similar or show minor reductions in Alternative 4A (ELT) compared to No Action Alternative (ELT) and are slightly higher relative to Existing Conditions. In the spring months, outflow would remain similar under Alternative 4A (ELT) as compared to No Action Alternative (ELT), and would be slightly reduced compared to Existing Conditions. In the fall months, outflow under Alternative 4A would increase relative to Existing Conditions, and as compared to the No Action Alternative (ELT), would be similar because of Fall X2 requirements in wet and above-normal years. Refer Appendix 5A in the Final EIR/EIS for more information. |
| 179 | 1 | How will the BDCP affect the production of rice, fruits of each kind, sunflower seeds, and other major delta crops, and the revenues which farmers get from producing them? In the cost-benefit analysis, what value is placed on each of the fish and wildlife species affected? How will these impacts be distributed geographically?<br><br>Given that the state has produced tens of thousands of pages of analysis, I anticipate that the state will be able to provide the public with answers to these questions. | DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.<br><br>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. |
| 179 | 2 | I oppose construction of the tunnels or analogous projects, under any name. | The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. |
| 180 | 1 | Totally misguided, misuse of political power. This issue needs to be presented to voters for their approval, not shoved down our thoughts. I feel you are going to ruin the delta. | The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. |
| 181 | 1 | The tunnels will ruin the Delta. This is a power and legacy move for Jerry Brown. If he was so worried about our environment he would stop this project.<br><br>Tired of government putting citizens in debt. | The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. 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. |
| 182 | 1 | The ecosystem is a totally integrated entity. Damage to one part ripples out to all.<br><br>There is an implicit disconnect between theory and execution. The path to completion is an obstacle course of greed, incompetence, poor oversight, shoddy workmanship, bad materials, and much more. One only has to look at the Bay Bridge for a recent example. | No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such 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. |
| 182 | 2 | Mr. Brown should stop taking on the cloak of a pope he clearly does not follow. He services corporate interest over environmental reality and is a prime hypocrite.<br><br>Moving water around serves no long-term solution. | The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. 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 |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | operational flexibility. |
| 183 | 1 | California WaterFix will not create any more water. Taking more fresh water from the estuary will result in ecological disaster. Many other alternatives have been brought forward at a fraction of the cost. These alternatives allow the water to flow naturally through the Delta, where it then can be piped to share with central and southern California, creating a win-win for all. Why are these not even being considered? | By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns while securing reliable water deliveries. 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. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports). Please refer to Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need. |
| 184 | 1 | The tunnels, as I understand, will take 14 years to build which will not help in our current drought. By building the tunnels, we are going to ruin a lot of recreation such as boating, fishing, and water skiing. The Delta is one of the most popular boating places in California. | The overall recreation experience for boaters 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. Chapter 15 of the EIR/EIS describes potential impacts to on-water recreation. Mitigation 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. |
| 184 | 2 | Building the tunnels will ruin the salmon fishing industry completely. By destroying the salmon population, we are taking away the jobs of commercial fishermen and fish markets. | Please refer to Chapter 11, Alternative 4A of the Final EIR/EIS for an analysis of effects of the preferred alternative, to salmon. The analysis finds that there would be no adverse effects to salmon or the salmon fishery. |
| 184 | 3 | If the tunnels are built, the salt water intrusion will prevent the farmers in the Delta from farming [because] they cannot water their crops with salt water. | 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).<br><br>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.<br><br>Please refer to Master Response 14, Water Quality, for more details regarding effects of the alternatives on salinity levels. |
| 184 | 4 | I have been around the Delta since childhood and would really hate to see it ruined by the almond farmers who want water. Plus, the salmon industry has been around much longer than the almond industry. | 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. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 35 (Beneficial Use of Water), and Master Response 5 (Conservation Measure 1 as a CM). |
| 184 | 5 | The only means of producing more fresh water is desalination. Simply building tunnels [and] moving water around does not produce more water in a drought. | For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. |
| 185 | 1 | EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) blasted the project and good papers have been prepared by the Environmental Water Caucus and the California Sport Fishing alliance. | The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the Clean Water Act and federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | These detailed reports challenge the tunnels project at every turn.<br><br>As it said in one report there has never been any freshwater-saltwater estuary that has been proven to be restored by removing more freshwater. I feel there is a real lack of integrity by State Employees in supporting the project. No honest scientist would support the Plan. | 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.<br><br>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. |
| 186 | 1 | Big agriculture is sucking us dry. We do not need more almonds and pistachios. Give them [sic] a tax credit for their losses and take the trees down! | State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via proposed conveyance facilities. |
| 186 | 2 | All of the money (including overruns) going to build the tunnels should be used to build desalinization plants. Given climate change, the ocean will be the best and most plentiful source of water. | For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. |
| 186 | 3 | The business, farm and tourist industries will suffer, if the tunnels are built, resulting in less tax revenues, more families struggling, and more stress on public resources (food banks, homeless, etc.). | Please see Master Response 5 regarding costs of implementation and funding for the BDCP. As described in Impact ECON-6 under Alternative 4A in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, construction of conveyance facilities would convert land from existing agricultural uses to project-related construction uses, and agricultural land could also be affected by changes in water quality and other conditions that would affect crop productivity. These direct effects on agricultural land are described under Impacts AG-1 and AG-2 in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources. Total value of irrigated crop production in the Delta would decline on average by $5.3 million per year during the construction period, with total irrigated crop acreage declining by about 4,700 acres. Other effects related to production costs, travel time, and loss of investments in production facilities and standing orchards and vineyards would also occur as a result of facilities construction. When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the alternative. While the compensation to property owners would reduce the severity of economic effects related to the loss of agricultural land, it would not constitute mitigation for any related physical impact.<br><br>Under Alternative 4A, publicly-owned water conveyance facilities would be constructed on land of which some is currently held by private owners. Property tax and assessment revenue generated by lands that would be transferred from private to is estimated to total $6.7 million over the construction period. Typically, decreases in revenue could potentially result in the loss of a substantial share of some agencies' tax bases and particularly for smaller districts affected by a project. However, California Water Code (Section 85089 subdivision 9b) specifies that the entities constructing and operating a new Delta conveyance facility will fully mitigate for the loss of property tax revenues or assessments levied by local governments or special districts. This Water Code requirement will ensure that tax revenues forgone as a result of transferring land from private to public ownership will be fully offset. |
| 186 | 4 | Property values will decline! I am ready to purchase a house on the Delta but I am afraid that the value of the home will plummet if the Delta is destroyed -- impeding current business. | When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the alternative. While the compensation to property owners would reduce the severity of economic effects related to the loss of agricultural land, it would not constitute mitigation for any related physical impact. As described in Impact ECON-3 in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics for Alternative 4A, property values may decline in areas that become less desirable in which to live, work, shop, or participate in recreational activities. For instance, negative visual- or noise-related effects on residential property could lead to localized abandonment of buildings. While water conveyance construction could result in beneficial |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | effects relating to the economic welfare of a community, adverse social effects could also arise as a result of declining economic stability in communities closest to construction effects and in those most heavily influenced by agricultural and recreational activities. Implementation of mitigation measures and environmental commitments related to noise, visual effects, transportation, agriculture, and recreation, would reduce adverse effects (see Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs). |
| 187 | 1 | 30 years ago the peripheral channels were a bad idea for Northern California - rejected in a referendum vote by 90% of voters from Northern California.<br><br>It's even a worse idea now! 2, 40' diameter tunnels to again, take huge quantities of Delta water south would be even more disastrous today!<br><br>The severe drought has demonstrated just how much worse the consequences for the Bay/Delta would be. There is no surplus water; there is no extra water. There is only remaining barely the minimum fresh water flows to prevent the Delta from a complete collapse into an eventual brakish/dead Salton Sea backwash.<br><br>Huge tunnels to remove even more water from a decimated eco-system - while purporting to restore and save the eco-system is an offensive PR spin - nothing more. | No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Operation of the water delivery system could not drain the Delta rivers and channels dry, including the Sacramento River. The project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities, including operations to protect water quality, 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).<br><br>The EIR/S modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present. |
| 187 | 2 | A lie was given to the co-equal goals of preserving the Delta while taking even more water from it; by the recent admission by the Brown Administration that restored wetlands would be reduced by 70,000 acres! So much for co-equal.<br><br>Further verification of this was the admission in 2013 by Natural Resources Deputy Director Jerry Meral, that the Delta cannot be saved. It's hard for even Brown Administration Offices to hide from the truth he went on to say the BDC Plan is not about saving the Delta. An untimely admission, that State Officials would not want to admit until after the tunnels are constructed. | State and Federal agencies developed the modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) in response to public and agency input. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. Alternative 4A reflects the State's proposal to separate the conveyance facility and habitat restoration measures into two separate efforts: California WaterFix and California EcoRestore. The Proposed Action includes habitat restoration as necessary to mitigate significant environmental effects and satisfy applicable ESA and CESA standards.<br><br>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.<br><br>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.<br><br>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. |
| 187 | 3 | Solving Southern California's water needs by taking more and more of a limited Northern resource is an out of date, no longer viable answer. It's time to let go of the tired and failing solution of the past.<br><br>The State will be faced with the same water demands issues 20 years from now, it faces | In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | today. After this short term fix runs its course and agribusiness, the Metropolitan Water District developers and land speculators again demand even more of a finite resource. Except, then we will have a dead Salton Sea, where the Delta used to be.<br><br>South Dakota would never try to take the vital water resources of North Dakota. North Dakota's rights would have to be acknowledged and respected. Not so for California, - where powerful Southern special interests feel entitled to raid the North for water - with little if any consequence. Be careful what you ask for - before we have to learn the lesson of North and South Dakota?<br><br>Water transfer is just another term for water grab. | to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal and State regulating agencies, ESA compliance, and project design. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease 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 exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods to improve ecosystem conditions in the Delta.<br><br>As described in Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives, the alternatives considered in the EIR/EIS do not include specific water transfers. The EIR/EIS acknowledges that water transfers would continue in a similar manner as historic transfers and in accordance with State and Federal laws and regulations. The EIR/EIS also acknowledges that the use of water transfers between agencies could increase in the future as SWP, CVP, and other surface water supplies are reduced due to climate change, sea level rise, and increased water demand in the Delta watershed, as described in Appendix 1E, Water Transfers in California: Types, Recent History, and General Regulatory Setting, and Appendix 5D, Water Transfer Analysis Methodology and Results, of the EIR/EIS. Because specific agreements have not been identified for water transfers and other non-project voluntary water market transactions, project level analysis of impacts upstream of the Delta is highly speculative and this EIR/EIS does not constitute the CEQA/NEPA coverage required for any specific transaction. Rather, it provides an analysis of how transfers relate to the conveyance facilities. As indicated in Appendix 5D, the analyses are conservative because it is not known if adequate water would be available from other water users for transfer. As shown in Table 5D-8, the maximum cross-Delta transfers under the action alternatives would be greatest under Alternative 8 because there would be the most available capacity. Any future water transfers will require separate approvals. The analysis of any potential upstream impacts is not a part of this EIR/EIS and must be covered pursuant to separate laws and regulations once the specific transfer has been proposed. |
| 188 | 1 | Please -- we must protect our water systems, including our Central Valley aquifer system and Bay-Delta region.<br><br>Two tunnels from our Delta system will only lead to a permanent drought, changes to our waterways, and cause unforeseeable damage. It will jeopardize our fish and water fowl, our beautiful Delta region, and our ability to provide for California farms, which provide food for much of the world.<br><br>No tunnels! Quit trying to mislead California. It is no fix. | 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.<br><br>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.<br><br>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. |
| 189 | 1 | These tunnels need to be stopped, the Plan is very flawed. The cost is out of control and will most likely have huge cost overruns. | The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding, respectively). |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Stop the tunnels now! We cannot afford this idiotic plan. | |
| 189 | 2 | Governor Brown is totally wrong, he is doing this as a legacy to his father and himself. I used to admire Brown for his hard work but he has lost it. | The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. |
| 190 | 1 | Given what we know about groundwater in California, and all over the world from pictures by the ISS, why are we not building desalinization plants? With so much salt water on this planet, why would we risk our Delta and fresh-water habitats any more than we already have? Even with the regulations and restrictions, I worry that, at any time, they could change them because of "emergency measures." Let us spend our money in a smart way for our future water needs. | For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. |
| 191 | 1 | The Environmental Impact of the proposed tunnels will ruin the Delta forever by bringing salt water up the system. The salt has already intruded on the Delta by the Tracy Aqueduct--government studies prove it. | 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. |
| 191 | 2 | The proposed tunnels are a ridiculous waste of money to ruin the environment. Use more Desalination plants on the coast rather than killing the environment. Will the people ever have a chance to speak?<br><br>Big agri-business can give you money to trample the will of the people. | 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. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 6 (Demand Management), and Master Response 7 (Desalination). |
| 192 | 1 | This project will destroy the Delta. It will turn it into a salt bog just like Mono Lake and the Owens Valley.<br><br>The only reason Westlands and LA Dept. of Water wants this is to improve the water quality they are presently getting. They have caused this problem themselves because they have been overpumping the Delta since the California Aqueduct was built.<br><br>The natural tidal flows in the Delta have been reversed for years. The original system should have never been built.<br><br>This project is too expensive and it will not solve south California and the desert corporate farm interests.<br><br>There are other ways to increase the water supply for L.A. and westlands water. Build desalination plants instead. Like San Diego County. | 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. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility.Please refer to Master Response 6 and Master Response 7 (Desalination), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply), and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need). |
| 193 | 1 | The twin tunnels are not a good choice. The California Water Plan/Fix is bad for Californians.<br><br>It's an expensive plan without a vote of the people and it doesn't make any more water for anyone!<br><br>To work to stop this and change it into a plan that will work has been a full time effort for me for the past six years. This plan needs to be stopped now, and real alternatives need to be vetted and seriously studied. | 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.<br><br>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 2 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. For additional information regarding Alternatives Development, please see Master Response 4. |
| 193 | 2 | Agriculture uses 80% of the water in California. Peter Gleick, a professor at Pacific Institute, did a study on irrigation in California about 5 years ago. He concluded and published that if farmers in California would use drip irrigation where appropriate on their crops, we would save enough water to fill Hetch Hetchy Reservoir 16 times every year! | For more information regarding agricultural beneficial water use please see Master Response 34. 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. |
| 193 | 3 | There is a concept of off-shore desalinization using wave action that has great potential for new water. | For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. |
| 193 | 4 | Air to water generators are being manufactured as we speak and could be made on a large scale and made affordable. Every home could have their own potable drinking water made from the air. | Although conservation components and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, they are beyond the scope of the BDCP or California WaterFix. |
| 193 | 5 | New storage?! Storage needs to be South of the Delta. Restore Tulare Lake Basin Hydrologic Water Region in California! | Please see Master Response 4 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the BDCP/California WaterFix or FEIR/EIS. For additional information regarding storage, please see Master Response 37. |
| 193 | 6 | There are many such ideas being generated--these are true avenues for New Water Sources! A scientist has discovered a source of primary water deep in the earth. It could be tapped! These are the answers! Not two tunnels that will devastate farms in Northern California and cause Salmon and Steelhead populations to go extinct. Jerry Brown, stop this madness and do the right thing. Make good choices! No water tunnels in California! | Please refer to Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives. 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.. 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.<br><br>Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 6 for information on demand management. |
| 194 | 1 | Separating the water fix from environmental mitigation was a mistake. People are concerned first about water quality and the existing fish, recreation and cultural habitat unique to the Delta. | 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.<br><br>Proposition 1 funds and other state and public dollars will be directed exclusively for public benefits unassociated with any regulatory compliance responsibilities.<br><br>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. |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| 194 | 2 | You cannot miss who is most aggressively promoting this Tunnel Plan: Big Agriculture. Ask local citizens if this is something they want. This is a project that should be voted on, it affects too large a segment of population to be driven by agencies alone. | As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the Clean Water Act and 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.<br><br>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. |
| 195 | 1 | The twin tunnels project was originally pitched as a way to help balance the problem of environmental impacts in the Delta with the need for consistent water supplies. Currently the project, another version of the Peripheral Canal voted down by voters, is long on taking clean Sacramento water and delivering it to powerful, moneyed ag. and Southern California interests. | 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. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Change in Delta Exports), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply). |
| 195 | 2 | The project asks the citizens and ecology of the Delta to bear the brunt of the environmental impacts during its construction. Areas of the Delta will have changed topography due to the depositing of tunnel borings in the Delta landscape. | The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Construction-related impacts are disclosed in individual resource area chapters in the EIR/EIS. All impacts would be minimized and mitigated to the degree feasible, as noted under each alternative in the EIR/EIS individual resource chapters and in Appendix 3B (Environmental Commitments) of the EIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 12 (Reusable Tunnel Material). |
| 195 | 3 | It is not clear that the project itself will help with the main problem of increased salinity and its impact on Delta ecosystem. Water conservation by farmers, and Southern California, as well as reinforced levees seems more certain to alleviate the problem of insufficient flows through the Delta. | 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. |
| 196 | 1 | I am opposed to the Delta tunnels. This is a huge impact -- 5,000 acres -- to the Delta and its inhabitants, both human and wildlife. Southern California needs to work on conserving water, instead of taking northern California's. Let us invest money in finding efficient use of water for the farmers. | 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.<br><br>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. |
| 197 | 1 | I am from Mendocino County. I traveled here today to let the people who are proposing the tunnels know that the California Delta is the heart of our state. The Delta has already taken many hits. We need to protect it, rather than take measures that continue to drain it. | 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. |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| 198 | 1 | Public and private business jobs can grow by: a) desalination (15 estuary points) and Sacramento Delta River; and b) dredging (for flow and less leakage, not sand bags). | The commenter does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. |
| 198 | 2 | Soil purifies water (by aeration and absorption). Silt can be rearranged (stated by levee engineer). Californians are productive (not by destructive twin tunnels, 40 feet wide, for 35 miles along the Sacramento Delta). That is short-sided. Fund for reforestation (for snowfall against flooding). | 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. |
| 198 | 3 | Support reservoirs for aquifers and ground water, in property rights. | No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Future reservoir projects are still undergoing evaluation or review, including potential surface water reservoir projects and groundwater storage projects. Therefore, potential storage projects are only considered in the EIR/S as cumulative impact projects (please see Master Response 37). 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.<br><br>It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). |
| 198 | 4 | All growers in the Central Valley are not the same. U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) maps show North San Joaquin County [NSJC] (not Central Valley south of 28 counties) soil: NSJC is mediterra sub-tropical, while southward is semi-arid. Growers cannot overwater for crops, nor disregard care for fertile soil. | State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via proposed conveyance facilities. |
| 198 | 5 | Californians productively: restore the Sacramento Delta River counties with various livelihoods: recreation; historic tourism; fishing and boating; small family farming (value food crops, #1 is USA, and other).<br><br>Note: timely Delta dredging is needed before El Nino heavy rains. Levee maintenance is 80% non-compliant. Northern California has drought. Invest is desalination (UCB, 1970's). | This comment is appears to be related to general Delta issues and on the contents of the EIR/EIs or review process. No response is necessary. |
| 199 | 1 | I am completely against the Twin Tunnel plan. This plan provides no new water for our state. The salt water intrusion will ruin our economy, agriculture, and our habitat. The twin tunnels are not a good fix for California's water dilemma. | 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.<br><br>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 |

| RECIRC Ltr# | Cmt# | Comment | Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | bromide and chloride).<br><br>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. |
| 199 | 2 | Has the state investigated or considered use of grey water reclamation systems as a way to increase efficient use of available water? | The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Although conservation components 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 BDCP or California WaterFix. 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, water recycling, etc. For more information regarding demand management please see Master Response 6. |
| 199 | 3 | Since scientists predict that we are currently entering into an El Niño weather pattern, has the state considered rain reclamation devices for businesses and homes that could be used throughout California as a means of mitigating drought conditions for farmers, homeowners, and recreational users? | The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Although conservation components 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 BDCP or California WaterFix. 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, water recycling, etc. For more information regarding demand management please see Master Response 6. |