

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1100	1	We are all connected to the creatures who call the Delta their home. Don't destroy it and them.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
1101	1	We cannot sacrifice the progress made in restoration of this area to keep aiding the agri-business that is farming a desert with wasteful methods.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p>
1102	1	Isn't there a less invasive way?	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. 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.</p>
1103	1	Water will continue to be a problem even if the tunnels are built and the ecosystem destroyed. This is a short-sighted plan. If the drought continues we cannot support agriculture in arid areas unless we adapt like Israel has.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 34 for additional details on the determination of beneficial use.</p>
1104	1	Let the water flow naturally!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The project proposes to improve water supply reliability and improve the Delta ecosystem by constructing a 9,000 cfs water diversion point in the north Delta, where its operations will provide for improved flows and</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			operational flexibility. 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. 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.
1105	1	I'm very concerned that this plan would devastate the region's ecology and endangered species.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
1106	1	Please, let's conserve the water we have as best we can.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1107	1	<p>This is beyond insane and totally not in your character Governor Brown!</p> <p>You have a history of making good decisions for the environment, and you are a spiritual man. If you meditate for 2 seconds on this, you know it is ludicrous! There is absolutely no reason for the Delta water tunnels, and they would destroy an ancient, natural water ecosystem that so many species, including humans, rely on for their survival. We know these human-engineered projects only work to benefit one consumer: big agriculture. They have been tried in the past, and we end [up] doing expensive restoration projects (if they get done) 100 years down the line because of the devastation. Don't even think about it!</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p>
1108	1	When you destroy the waterways and compromise the Bay, you destroy the livelihood of others, animals included. Tons of water is held back by grape growers that have built ponds. When we have drought, we don't need wine and grapes can be grown by dry land farmers as [they have] been for centuries.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			operational flexibility. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
1109	1	Farmers in the San Joaquin area and politicians in Los Angeles will always ask for more water. We will destroy natural ecosystems in the north that sustain farming, fish, and habitat now throughout California. We need to change how we use water and grow crops now.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 34 for additional details on the determination of beneficial use. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.</p>
1110	1	I grew up on the Delta, so I have a stake in its continuing as a vital ecosystem. The water diversion for the sake of corporate agriculture profiteering is a disaster in the making. Please do not allow it.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The project 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 almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p>
1111	1	We shouldn't drain water from the Bay-Delta to appease corporate farmers. Destroying the ecosystem there could result in species becoming extinct!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
1112	1	I'm a Northern California native and have been through this water grab before. It's time for the central and southern parts of the state to take responsibility for their egregious need for our water.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The 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 almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p>
1113	1	Our water laws need reworking entirely! A tunnel to drain one part of California to benefit	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		another part is not what I mean .	<p>Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A. The premise of the California WaterFix is that it will provide environmental benefits while stabilizing water supplies for a large population of California residents, consistent with statutory policy as found in the Delta Reform Act of 2009 (see, e.g., California Public Resources Code, §§ 85001(c), 85002, 85004(a), 85020.) Refer to Master Response 31 (Compliance with the Delta Reform Act). The plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Although the 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. State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to stipulated beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows.</p>
1114	1	Stop massively rearranging Mother Nature to serve your goals, Governor Brown. What has happened to you with your earth-shattering political agenda? This is not supportive of water, fish or a good way to serve Californians. If you would do more to control sediment from logging, pollution from fracking and farming we would all benefit.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The 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.</p>
1115	1	Humans share the planet, California included, with thousands of diverse species of flora and fauna if we devastate their habitat, it results in irrevocable damage. I'd rather not consume almonds and pistachios than further destroy California's few remaining ecosystems.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
1116	1	We do not have the money to support two massive 35-mile underground water export tunnels in order to support all the green lawns in Los Angeles and Palm Springs and all the almond farmers and cotton farmers and fracking oil needs for California. How about a 600-mile underground import tunnel from the Colorado River? Oh, that's right; we already do that.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Refer to Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 35 (Southern California’s Water Supply), Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Cost).
1117	1	I oppose the Bay-Delta tunnels. We are at a crossroads in California, where we can go towards water-conserving crops and drip irrigation, or go on wasting our most precious resource. Governor Brown, we expect better decisions from you. Look to the future of water use in California. We've proved people can conserve; now it's agriculture's turn.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. 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. Also, please see Master Response 34 for additional details on the determination of beneficial use and Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.</p>
1118	1	Please don't destroy our Delta for a few rich farmers!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1119	1	We have to live with the reality of less water. Short-sighted plans to "fix" the results of our multi-year drought help no one in the long run. Let's be real about our situation, and come up with sustainable agricultural and environmental solutions to address the entire state's need for water.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 34 for additional details on the determination of beneficial use and Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.</p>
1120	1	<p>Destroy Westlands! That project never should have happened in the semi-arid Central Valley area. We should be growing crops suitable for a semi-arid area. Before, it was cotton, which has no place in California. Almonds don't have any place in central California, either. Most growers in central California are out-of-state industrial agriculture owners, and we Californians are tired of wasting our water so avaricious out-of-state corporate fat cats can make a profit, while California's environment is destroyed.</p> <p>That water is Northern California water, and we need it for our Delta and for our Northern California fisheries!</p> <p>No tunnels! In this case, Brown obviously is owned by out-of-state big agriculture.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that 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 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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>The project is just one element of the state’s long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California’s water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). The proposed project would not increase the amount of water to which SWP and CVP hold water rights for use allowed under their contracts and permits and approvals for refuge water supplies or other environmental purposes.</p>
1121	1	Big agriculture, whether almonds or cattle or whatever, [is] the biggest problem to our water future! We need to be more proactive about what is best for the people!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that 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 issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan’s strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>The project is just one element of the state’s long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California’s water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). The proposed project would not increase the amount of water to which SWP and CVP hold water rights for use allowed under their contracts and permits and approvals for refuge water supplies or other environmental purposes.</p>
1122	1	Stop the Delta tunnels. It’s no water fix. If the water flows are reduced from [the] Sacramento River, won’t that make the Bay into the Delta fill with ocean water? There is an ecosystem that needs to be considered. This needs to stop and be studied further to understand the possible long-term effects of this project.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The project's proposed dual conveyance facilities would allow water to be moved through the Delta when conditions permit, and allow water to be diverted from the Sacramento River in the northern Delta when conditions in the south Delta do not permit diversions from the existing State Water Project and Central Valley Project facilities. The location of the north Delta diversion facility is less vulnerable to salinity</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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.</p> <p>Under the stringent environmental statutes in place today, including the Endangered Species Act, operation of the proposed water delivery system could not drain the Delta rivers and channels dry, including the Sacramento River. The proposed project's facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants, would be operated in accordance with permits issued by, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the State Water Resources Control Board, among other agencies. The proposed project would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards.</p>
1123	1	One may read of people being able to walk across Central Valley streams on the backs of salmon in the 19th century. This is likely hyperbole, but does reflect the irresponsible use of California's water.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1124	1	Water is life! Stop giving away our water to corporations!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>As stated in 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 or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p>
1125	1	We need to re-think what crops are now appropriate for California and not endanger one system to give water to another that is proving to be unsustainable.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			operational flexibility. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
1126	1	Why have you turned against our people and our state? You used to stand for something! Now you are like all the rest, show me the money!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1127	1	No more sucking sound, taking our water for Southern Californian lawns and pools...enough!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Although the 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. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented California WaterFix would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Please see Master Response 26 for additional information on effects on northern California and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>
1128	1	Please say no to the Delta Tunnels--they will divert huge amounts of water just for use of industrial-scale agriculture, including almonds and pistachios. The people, fish, and wildlife of the delta and San Francisco Bay Area need this water.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that 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 issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). The proposed project would not increase the amount of water to which SWP and CVP hold water rights for use allowed under their contracts and permits and approvals for refuge water supplies or other environmental purposes.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1129	1	The Delta tunnels project has a huge chance of negatively impacting many wild creatures, who are already suffered badly due to bizarre weather and lack of food/safe areas to have babies. We are fooling ourselves if we think this will not also create bad problems for humans. Please do not put this into action. This is not a water fix, rather it is a water grab.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
1130	1	This outrageously priced plumbing would make possible exports of even more water to San Joaquin Valley agribusiness interests. These corporations should conserve water instead. It would make a lot more sense economically and ecologically.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of a particular water supply augmentation approach (greater agricultural conservation) and does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the proposed project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>For more information regarding agricultural beneficial water use please see Master Response 34.</p>
1131	1	This is not the answer, to destroy our Delta for the almonds. Please leave our natural resources intact by opposing the Delta tunnels.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The 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.</p>
1132	1	I've been opposed to this from day one because I depend upon springs and a well to water my 40 acres. If this is allowed to go through, I may not be able to access the groundwater under my land.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>As described in the EIR/EIS, during construction, slurry walls would be constructed around the construction site at the intakes, tunnel shafts, and forebays to reduce the effect of dewatering wells. Dewatering wells</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>also would be installed at construction sites associated with levees without the use of slurry walls. No dewatering would be required along the tunnel alignment. The effects on groundwater at locations with slurry wall installations would not result in significant effects as compared to Existing Conditions. It is possible, that some impacts may result in effects depending upon specific information that would be collected during design and construction phase. Mitigation measures have been identified in the EIR/EIS to reduce the impacts to less than significant as compared to Existing Conditions. Mitigation Measures AG-1, GW-1, GW-5, and WQ-11 will reduce the severity of significant impacts in agricultural areas by implementing activities such as siting project footprints to encourage continued agricultural production; monitoring changes in groundwater levels during construction; monitoring seepage effects; relocating or replacing agricultural infrastructure in support of continued agricultural activities; identifying, evaluating, developing, and implementing feasible phased actions to reduce EC levels; engaging counties, owners/operators, and other stakeholders in developing optional agricultural stewardship approaches; and/or preserving agricultural land through off-site easements or other agricultural land conservation interests.</p>
1133	1	<p>Protecting crops such as almonds, most of which are exported is not the price we need to pay to provide water to the state. Use new technology and get smart about better ways to provide adequate water for the state.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the proposed project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan’s strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
1134	1	<p>I hope you acknowledge the fragile balance of the Delta and how it affects other regions. Please don't create havoc with this delicate ecology by making underground water export tunnels.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
1135	1	<p>Don't give in to special interests. Water is a common which belongs to all of us.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1136	1	This is not a viable, sensible plan. It's a pathologic anti-remedy that will hurt many and benefit a few. We have profiteering extractors at the helm who care nothing for the gestalt, much less the commons. Our governor's gone transparently idiotic on this issue and he should be ashamed.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
1137	1	Our Delta, the people of Northern California's Delta, needs your protection. The Delta's rich estuaries, its ecology, have been under siege from greedy developers, water-starved farmers (both corporate and individuals) for years. Maybe, just maybe, there needs to be a mindful recognition that our state is overdeveloped in terms of its limitations. Especially during the recent drought, a harbinger of less rain and much less snow pack, responsible leaders must accept the "new normal" and include ALL life in their political decisions. Even your Jesuit Pontiff understands this concept!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The project 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 almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p>
1138	1	The theft of water from the Delta will devastate wildlife and ecology. Do not build this tunnel.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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.</p>
1139	1	This is in support of specific individuals and shouldn't be allow to happen. Our ecosystem is too important, as well a stop of theft of water at the cost of everyone.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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.</p>
1140	1	<p>Once again state sponsored water theft for industries and, yes, the mid to southern part of the state that will deplete the natural water cycles of Northern California. Stop it now.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. No response is required.</p>
1141	1	<p>The salmon industry of the bay area is very important to me and I don't think it could withstand this ill-advised tunnel vision. Please don't let our bay and delta be destroyed.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/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.</p>
1142	1	<p>I am really concerned to hear about these plans. We all know that there is a drought in California. There is no fixing the drought like that.</p> <p>We have to save water here in California. The ecosystem in the Bay Area will get completely out of balance! Please rethink this plan. We teach our children to be respectful towards nature every day and they know how to save water but political decisions like that really destroy every hope. Our children have to live in this world too!</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>
1143	1	<p>The Delta Tunnels Plan will devastate the Delta's ecosystem while putting us all at risk of losing our endangered salmon, other fish and most precious ecosystems. Please stop ignoring the sustainable alternatives that include jobs and investing in local water sources.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/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.</p>
1144	1	<p>I just drove through the agriculture belt of California, and although growers know almonds require an intensive investment of water, they are planting new almond trees on a huge scale. That is ridiculous and should be unprofitable. Allowing them to have water preferences and new sources is unconscionable.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that 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 issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). The proposed project would not increase the amount of water to which SWP and CVP hold water rights for use allowed under their contracts and permits and approvals for refuge water supplies or other environmental purposes. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1145	1	<p>This agribusiness water-grab, if allowed, would be environmentally disastrous. Please do not allow it.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The commenter does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1146	1	The project is deceptively named the "California Water Fix." But we know better. It is a water grab by the Southern California water companies that will destroy the Delta and estuary permanently and doom all the species living there to extinction.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/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) and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).</p>
1147	1	This water grab is worse than the draining of Mono Lake by Los Angeles. Delta ecosystem is critical to maintain!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p>
1148	1	Our climate is rapidly changing. We need to adapt our lives to this change. How long will this drought last? How long until we run out of water? We cannot and should not give in to industry and to destroy natural habitats in the process.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
1149	1	All we have to do is develop the technology for collecting rainwater and cleaning it up! All this underground stuff is a big waste of time and green money. Please put the money into something that will work for our children's children's children's children's children's children's future.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 6 (Demand Management).</p>
1150	1	We need to restore our damaged waterways not destroy them. This "Fix" is a farce. Stop!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A. The premise of the California WaterFix is that it will provide environmental benefits while stabilizing water supplies for a large population of California residents, consistent with statutory policy as found in the Delta Reform Act of 2009 (see, e.g., California Public Resources Code, §§ 85001(c), 85002, 85004(a), 85020.) Refer to Master Response 1 (Compliance with the Delta Reform Act). The project would help to address the resilience and adaptability of the Delta to climate change through water delivery facilities combined with a range of operational scenarios. In addition to the added water management flexibility created by new water diversions and operational scenarios, the project would improve habitat, increase food supplies and reduce the effects of other stressors on the Delta ecosystem.</p>
1151	1	Let's be realistic. The only way to maintain water is to conserve water not to parasitize one part of the country/state for another part. Let's learn to live within our environment, not sacrifice the environment for the ultimate detriment of everyone.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p>
1152	1	Creating one disaster to help avert a different disaster is not a viable solution. The Delta area has already suffered numerous damaging attacks in the past with few restoration projects to correct the problems that continue to develop there. In this case more requires less.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p>
1153	1	Really, Jerry? Do you really want your legacy to be that you helped to irreparably destroy the Delta ecosystem to meet the political desires of Big Agriculture?	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The 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.</p>
1154	1	Drilling huge water tunnels will only exacerbate the condition of the bay which is teetering on extinction. Without our bay, the area would be oxygen deprived.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
1155	1	Please don't let this project go through. The Delta and California's rich waterways have been compromised for years already. Diverting more water in this way is not the answer to our problems. Let's find a solution that works for the north as well as the south. And find solutions to the problems of Central Valley agriculture, which go deeper than needing more water.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements.</p> <p>The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management). The proposed project would not increase the amount of water to which SWP and CVP hold water rights for use allowed under their contracts and permits and approvals for refuge water supplies or other environmental purposes.</p>
1156	1	Do not kill the ecology of the largest estuary on the West Coast. This region hosts 20% of all of North America's migrating or wintering waterfowl population, to drop one figure. It's already suffering. Please, instead, work to ensure its health and resiliency. Stealing massive amounts of water from the Delta would be unforgivable.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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 amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the 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/S.</p>
1157	1	With the drought there is no water to send. Keep the Delta floating with the bit of water that there is. Do not send it anywhere!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1158	1	Let's protect our dwindling water!	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p> <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1159	1	California has had too much water-loss from the drought already. We cannot afford to send water to industrial agriculture now. When we get an abundance of water from substantial rain fall, maybe we could consider doing that. But not now! Besides, then it won't be needed!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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 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.</p> <p>Providing regulatory oversight to agribusinesses is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. Please see Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via Alternative 4A (California WaterFix) proposed conveyance facilities. Contractors and their customers must make economic decisions about planting in light of the amounts of water they are likely to receive going forward.</p> <p>The project would help to address the resilience and adaptability of the Delta to climate change through water delivery facilities combined with a range of operational flexibility. In addition to the added water management flexibility created by new water diversions and operational scenarios, the project would improve habitat, increase food supplies and reduce the effects of other stressors on the Delta ecosystem. Please see Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need of the proposed project.</p>
1160	1	Please find other alternatives and protect our environment.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>15 alternatives and 3 new subalternatives were analyzed in the EIR/S and the RDEIR/RSEIS respectively. Four major alignments have been included in the EIR/S: Through-Delta, East of the Sacramento River, West of the Sacramento River, and a Tunnel under the Delta. Many additional proposals by public and private individuals and organizations have also been evaluated and described in Chapter 3 of the BDCP EIR/S and Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the development of alternatives. Please see Master Response 6 for information on Demand Management.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1161	1	Jerry, you need to put people and nature ahead of greed and profit.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1162	1	There must be another more intelligent way to access water without damaging another unique, precious ecosystem.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
1163	1	We are opposed to construction (disruption) that will disturb the Delta eco-system even further. Species that require this very special environment cannot survive the proposed diversion of water.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
1163	2	Agriculture, while long established in California, can change its approach and, with the change in climate will eventually have to do so anyway.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
1164	1	I grew up in the Delta and would hate to see it sacrificed for venture capital almonds grown on toxic soil in the southwest San Joaquin Valley.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1164	2	We should protect endangered species and farms of the Delta that have been providing food for more than 100 years.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation).</p>
1165	1	Tree crops are a bad choice for this area that has so little water of its own. Replant with yearly crops that can be expanded or taken out easily depending on water availability. No more almond and pistachio orchards.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via proposed conveyance facilities.</p>
1166	1	We need to recharge our water tables, not let industrial "farmers" grab the water for export crops.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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 groundwater recharge, 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).</p>
1167	1	Stop selling our water to corporate ag!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. No response is required.</p>
1168	1	We're in a severe drought. Northern California does not have the water to support Southern California's water profligacy. We need water to drink and to grow crops to feed ourselves. The proposed tunnels will take our water to grow crops for export and to enrich Big Ag. No to the Delta tunnels.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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 almost 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). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the Section 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the preferred alternative would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p>
1169	1	<p>Salmon are already endangered and these tunnels will be the end of their environment forever. Fisheries have already the lowest amount of water in decades, so pumping more water out will devastate most of the species that live in the Delta. No water diversion tunnels!</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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 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.</p> <p>For more information regarding impacts to aquatic resources and its mitigation measures please see Chapter 11 of the FEIR/EIS.</p>
1170	1	<p>The Sacramento Delta is a special place, with a unique ecosystem. It is home to sturgeon, salmon, and many types of wildlife. While water is a critical resource in the state, robbing the Delta of this precious resource is short-sighted and will do irreparable harm to our environment. I strongly urge the state and federal agencies to stop these tunnels. Require farmers to either use better irrigation techniques or move to less water-intensive crops.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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 any change in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in 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).</p> <p>The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p>
1171	1	Please protect our precious waterways and do not sign off on this project which would simply destroy our fragile ecosystem.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
1172	1	Our sister species (all other animals) need our protection now. And we need to learn how to live in harmony with all of the other beings in our environment.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
1173	1	There are much better ways to deal with our need for water. Don't go in this direction.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. No response is required.</p>
1174	1	Protect water and protect salmon.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Discussion of the main environmental attributes affecting individual covered species are provided in Appendix 2.A of the 2013 public draft BDCP. Effects of the proposed water conveyance and associated restoration activities on general resource areas are discussed in Ch. 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Resource areas are addressed separately under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, public health, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible.</p>
1175	1	Every time I turn around there's a new threat to the environment being proposed. Let's reverse this destructive trend.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Because of the highly technical and complex nature of the proposed project and the importance of the Delta as a natural resource and to the California water supply, the 2013 draft EIR/EIS and the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS contains considerable amounts of information.</p> <p>The draft documents cover impacts to 14 natural communities and land use types, 149 special-status wildlife and plant species, 11 covered fish species and 9 non-covered fish species. These documents reflect seven years of collaboration, responses to requests for additional information, careful thought, accumulation of the latest scientific information, and thorough analyses needed to develop and conduct an environmental review of a project that impacts the Delta estuary and water supplies for millions of Californians. In addition, the RDEIR/SDEIS contained approximately 9,300 pages including the new proposed project (Alternative 4A) and two additional alternatives. The size and complexity of these drafts reflect an unprecedented effort to analyze project alternatives under both state and federal laws for a habitat conservation plan along with 15 Alternatives.</p> <p>Although the science and analyses that support the proposed project is complex, the lead agencies have made every attempt to present the information in plain language and in a clear format with emphasis on the information that is useful to the public, agencies, and decision-makers.</p> <p>To assist reviewers, the Lead Agencies provided a “Document Review Road Map” at the beginning of the RDEIR/SDEIS. The road map is similar to an illustrated table of contents and shows how the RDEIR/SDEIS correlates to the Draft EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 5 for additional information on the length of the environmental document.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1175	1	Portions of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California Water Fix, July 2015 (BDCP) were reviewed. Due to the large volume of data and text, it was not possible to completely review the documents and the revisions.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Because of the highly technical and complex nature of the proposed project and the importance of the Delta as a natural resource and to the California water supply, the 2013 draft EIR/EIS and the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS contains considerable amounts of information.</p> <p>The draft documents cover impacts to 14 natural communities and land use types, 149 special-status wildlife and plant species, 11 covered fish species and 9 non-covered fish species. These documents reflect seven years of collaboration, responses to requests for additional information, careful thought, accumulation of the latest scientific information, and thorough analyses needed to develop and conduct an environmental review of a project that impacts the Delta estuary and water supplies for millions of Californians. In addition, the RDEIR/SDEIS contained approximately 9,300 pages including the new proposed project (Alternative 4A) and two additional alternatives. The size and complexity of these drafts reflect an unprecedented effort to analyze project alternatives under both state and federal laws for a habitat conservation plan along with 15 Alternatives.</p> <p>Although the science and analyses that support the proposed project is complex, the lead agencies have made every attempt to present the information in plain language and in a clear format with emphasis on the information that is useful to the public, agencies, and decision-makers.</p> <p>To assist reviewers, the Lead Agencies provided a "Document Review Road Map" at the beginning of the RDEIR/SDEIS. The road map is similar to an illustrated table of contents and shows how the RDEIR/SDEIS correlates to the Draft EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 38 for additional information on the length of the environmental document.</p>
1175	2	BDCP Conveyance Facilities: The BDCP conveyance facilities of the preferred Alternative 4A for 9,000 cfs [cubic feet per second] include three intakes, three sedimentation basins, pipelines, tunnel, intermediate forebay, dual tunnels, pumping plant and revisions to Clifton Court Forebay (Fig. ES-1). The dual-bore 40-foot ID [internal diameter] tunnel is approximately 30 miles in length and would be constructed in soft alluvial soils at a depth of 100 to 150 feet. High groundwater pressures exist in the tunnel foundations. Because of the large tunnel diameter, large depth of construction in soft alluvial soils, high groundwater pressures and extensive tunnel length, the precedent of similar construction could not be found in any reference. Surprise, the project is unprecedented!	Large tunnel projects similar to the proposed project are not unprecedented. The Alaskan Way Viaduct bored road replacement tunnel, a 56-foot-wide and two-mile long tunnel, is currently under construction in Seattle, Washington, an area with high amounts of alluvial soil. The project is boring the tunnel with the world's largest-diameter tunnel-boring machine a machine that would be similar to the one used for constructing the California WaterFix tunnels. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
1175	3	Lack of information: There is no description for how the twin tunnel bores would be dewatered, or the type, thickness and construction of the tunnel lining. Dewatering the tunnel bore and constructing a liner at 100 ft. depth for 30 miles with high groundwater will be difficult. The lack of discussion on tunnel dewatering is a serious omission. How about dewatering the twin tunnels at 150ft. depth under the San Joaquin River? Water under the tunnel bore, on both sides and on top (San Joaquin River). This construction will be challenging, and appropriate for unplanned "safe haven technology" (App. A Pg. 3-41). There are (1) no cost estimates for Alternative 4A or the other alternatives in the BDCP, (2) no discussions of basis of selection of Alternative 4A as the preferred alternative or (3) construction schedules. This lack of study and information is a prescription for cost overruns and fiscal disaster for the State of California! Surprise again, this lack of information for a project this size is unprecedented! Appears that the BDCP says: "Never mind! Just build it!"	<p>As described in Appendix 3C, Construction Assumptions for Water Conveyance Facilities, and Chapter 7, Groundwater, of the EIR/EIS, dewatering would occur at the tunnel shafts following drilling of the shaft, placement of the impervious shaft liner, and placement of impervious liner at the bottom of the shaft. The Tunnel Boring Machine would use a mechanized closed-face boring head to drill the tunnel bore and to place impervious liners concurrently as the machine moves forward. The boring head will minimize groundwater from entering the lined tunnel during construction. The tunnel liners will be impermeable to avoid groundwater from entering the tunnel or water from the tunnel from entering the groundwater. No dewatering activities would occur along the tunnel alignment between the tunnel shafts.</p> <p>The basis of selection of the Proposed Project is discussed in Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives, and the Executive Summary of the EIR/EIS. The issue related to the cost estimate as raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		We need to get Alternative 4A construction started by 2017!"	in the EIR/EIS. Construction schedules for the Proposed Project are presented in Appendix 3C of the EIR/EIS.
1175	4	2012 Capital Costs The 2012 estimated capital costs for the conveyance facilities was \$14.6B (BDCP Highlights Dec. 2013, Page 86). It is expected that when preliminary design is completed capital costs will significantly increase.	Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.
1175	5	Dewatering: Dewatering the dual tunnel for 30 miles including under the San Joaquin River is a particular challenge. Water sources at the San Joaquin River will be on both sides, below the tunnel and top (San Joaquin River). Alternative 4A alignment crosses under the Mokelumne Aqueduct (EBMUD [East Bay Municipal Utility District]) and the railroad line on the north side of Woodward Island (Fig. M3-4 Sheet 10 of 15). Both the aqueduct and the railroad are on piles at Woodward Island and could be susceptible to settlement. The Los Vaqueros Pipeline could also be susceptible to settlement. Groundwater levels could be lowered in this area since ... "Dewatering systems would be designed and operated to control seepage pressures in the vicinity of the main bore and the vertical shafts to ensure that excavations remain stable." (App. A Pg.3-42.) Again, there is no description of the method or depth of dewatering in this area or the entire project.	As described in Appendix 3C, Construction Assumptions for Water Conveyance Facilities, and Chapter 7, Groundwater, of the EIR/EIS, dewatering would occur at the tunnel shafts following drilling of the shaft, placement of the impervious shaft liner, and placement of impervious liner at the bottom of the shaft. The Tunnel Boring Machine would use a mechanized closed-face boring head to drill the tunnel bore and to place impervious liners concurrently as the machine moves forward. The boring head will minimize groundwater from entering the lined tunnel during construction. The tunnel liners will be impermeable to avoid groundwater from entering the tunnel or water from the tunnel from entering the groundwater. No dewatering activities would occur along the tunnel alignment between the tunnel shafts.
1175	6	Tunnel Lining: There is a lack of tunnel information. Fig. 3-21 was referenced in the text (App. A, Page 3-40), but not found. Design consideration should be given to possible changed conditions of the 40 ft. ID [internal diameter] lining and loading when relining of the tunnels occurs in say 50 to 75 years. (Note that when the liner thickness is included, the TBM [tunnel boring machine] diameter could be as much as 50 ft.). These load conditions are necessary for design to reduce the potential for progressive failure of the dual tunnel that will be continually under pressure and then dewatered after 50 to 75 years. Note "reduce the potential," is used since construction of the dual bore 40-foot ID tunnel is unlikely to be perfect, the potential is unlikely to be eliminated. Repair of progressive failure of the 40 ft. ID dual tunnel at a depth of 100 to 150 feet could be prohibitively expensive and require a long time for dewatering and repair.	With the engineering completed to date, it is anticipated that the TBM will be 45-feet in diameter, not 50-feet. The tunnel lining system will be designed for a 100 year life, which is consistent with many other major infrastructure projects in the country. As such, it's not expected the tunnel will need to be relined during its useful lifespan. Additionally, corrosion or other conditions that would cause deterioration of the tunnel lining system are not anticipated to occur during the life of the tunnel under the operational conditions that are planned for the tunnel. Specific criteria of making potential future repairs to the tunnels will be addressed in the next stages of the design process. We are unclear what the commenter means by "progressive failure" of the dual tunnel, hence we are unable to provide a specific response to this assertion. However, two tunnels are being proposed such that one tunnel can be taken out of service for inspections and repairs (if necessary) while the second tunnel remains in service.
1175	7	Tunnel Repairs: Because of high cost, difficulty of repairs, and long construction repair period for repairs due to seismic loadings, consideration should be given to design of the tunnels for the Maximum Credible Earthquake (MCE).	Tunnel design criteria will be defined as required for infrastructure of critical nature. Work being performed for the SFPUC requires these facilities to withstand the seismic motion and be repairable to full capacity within 30 days. Similar design criteria will be employed for these tunnels. They will be designed to withstand the seismic design event with no damage, and suffer limited damage under the largest events so repairs can be performed in a limited length of time to get back into service.
1175	8	Pumping Plant: Usually a pumping plant (Alternative 4A) would be located at the upstream near the intermediate forebay. The downstream location near Clifton Court Forebay allows the tunnel to operate at lower internal pressures, but the lower pressures increase the potential for soils to enter the tunnel through cracks or reduced thickness of the lining and/or concrete joints. These cracks could be caused by settlement, seismic activity and/or site specific ground conditions. In addition the repair of the pumps at 125-foot depth due to damage from settlement or seismic loadings would be less costly with the pumping plant near the surface than at depth. Consideration should be given to locating the pumping plant adjacent to the intermediate forebay near the ground surface.	The comment is correct that locating the pumping plant in the south at the Clifton Court Forebay reduces the internal pressures on the tunnel lining system. The benefit of reduced internal pressures is that the concrete tunnel lining segments would now be in compression, in lieu of net tension, resulting in a much more reliable and robust design, with a lower probability of cracks and leaks. Additionally, a deep pump station will be less susceptible to settlement as the structure is lighter than the material excavated to build it, basically floating in the surrounding ground. The walls and the rest of the structure will be designed to withstand seismic loads so it is not damaged during a seismic event.
1175	9	Sedimentation: DWR has included sedimentation basins after the fish screens and intakes. The intermediate forebay also will assist in the removal of sediment. If all of the sediment is not removed after the water enters the twin tunnels, a portion of the sediment could	The current design for the California WaterFix includes several measures to manage sediment. These measures include positioning intake fish-screen inverters approximately 3 feet above the river bottom to avoid diverting sediments that move along river bed, sediment jetting system located within the intake structure,

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>accumulate at the lower elevations of the tunnels such as at river and rail crossings (San Joaquin River, etc.). There appear to be at least eight crossings where the elevation of tunnels may have to be lowered to avoid water and pilings of existing aqueducts. Since water velocity in the twin tunnels is low (<4fps [feet per second]) and zero at times, removal of sediment at resumption of flow may not occur. Sediment that is not removed by flushing action could accumulate gradually at the lower areas and restrict subsequent water flow. Since twin tunnel flow is by gravity, flushing action is unlikely and removal of sediment could require dewatering of the tunnel. This potential sedimentation condition needs to be addressed in the revised BDCP by describing how all of the sediment will be removed and give references to previous studies by others.</p>	<p>and sedimentation basins and intermediate forebay to capture sediments in the diverted water. Sedimentation basins and the intermediate forebay have been sized to capture all settling particles that are considered collectible by a gravity system. Additional analyses will be conducted as part of future engineering phases to refine the sediment management system proposed for the project.</p>
1175	10	<p>BDCP: The BDCP should protect the ecology of the Delta and provide water deliveries to a level consistent with the available water. NEPA and CEQA have set environmental requirements for the Delta water deliveries. The requirements have been modified several times since the SWP was completed in 1970. Clearly, the amount of water to be delivered each year needs to be defined by the environmental conditions. DWR needs to work with EPA, CEQA personnel and USACE [US Army Corp of Engineers] to develop the amount of water delivery.</p>	<p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal and State regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the 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/S. Operations of the facilities also would require permits and approvals from the State Water Resources Control Board which manages implementation of the Clean Water Act for U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in California, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S.</p>
1175	11	<p>Diversions at Clarksburg and Water Quality: DWR needs to show the data that demonstrate how diversions at Clarksburg improve water quality and environmental conditions in the Delta. For example, if water was diverted at Clarksburg at the Intakes, how much was the salinity reduced or increased at Decker Island? The monitoring point at Emmaton (Decker Island) could be a reasonable location to compare real time and model study environmental data (salinity, etc.) for diverting water at Clarksburg for the Alternatives 2D, 4A, SA, 9, and existing condition). Other monitoring points should also be evaluated. For example, using the NEP A and CEQA limit (in ppm [parts per million]) for salinity at Emmaton, provide the values for the alternatives and existing condition and comment on the basis for selection of Alternative 4A as the preferred alternative, and the reasons that environmental conditions are improved by diverting the water at Clarksburg.</p>	<p>Changes in salinity in the Delta due to the alternatives are reflected in the assessment of the salinity-related parameters bromide, chloride, and electrical conductivity (EC) in Chapter 8, Water Quality, Impacts WQ-5 (bromide), WQ-7 (chloride), and WQ-11 (EC). The Sacramento River at Emmaton was one of the 11 Delta assessment locations. The assessment of effects of the alternatives was evaluated by comparing modeled bromide, chloride, and EC under the alternatives to conditions under Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative. Certain Delta locations, particularly the export pump locations, would generally have reduced levels of these constituents under the alternatives.</p>
1175	12	<p>Surface Alternatives: Note that Alternative 9 was included as a surface alternative in Item 10 for comparison. The inclusion of Alternative 9 is because it is the only surface alternative (that could be found) besides the existing condition. The existing condition should be modified to develop surface alternative(s) to facilitate the transfer of water to Clifton Court Forebay. The development of a surface alternative that has minimal impact on agriculture and the environment could be the preferred alternative.</p>	<p>As explained in Final EIR/EIS Appendix 3A “Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives” the alternative development process for the EIR/EIS was based upon a number of legal considerations including: (1) the legal requirements for adequate discussions of alternatives in an EIR and EIS, as set forth in CEQA and NEPA respectively, and the regulations and case law interpreting those statutory schemes; (2) the concepts of “potential feasibility” under CEQA and “reasonableness” under NEPA; and (3) the requirements of Water Code Section 85320 from the 2009 Delta Reform Act.</p> <p>For additional detail on how alternatives were chosen, please see Master Response 4.</p>
1175	13	<p>In the next five to ten years there are at least two tasks for DWR: (1) Work with EPA, CEQA personnel, and USACE [US Army Corps of Engineers] to reduce the environmental conditions that are causing risk to the Delta, and (2) Revise BDCP to select a preferred alternative. Both surface and tunnel alternatives need to be considered. Design concepts need to be explained, water deliveries shown, and cost estimates and construction schedules prepared.</p>	<p>Comment is recommending tasks for DWR to accomplish. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1175	14	Expect that the people of the State of California will be allowed the opportunity to vote on the project. I will copy these comments to my state representatives to ensure that we are allowed to vote on the project.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1176	1	It's hard to believe a massive engineering project like this one could do anything but add more degradation to an already deeply distressed ecosystem. Now is not the time to prop up questionable industrial agricultural practices.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
1177	1	The carrying capacity of the tunnels is far beyond the finite supply of water available this will lead to both inequality of this limited resource in addition to the destruction of the Delta ecosystem.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>As stated in 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 or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.</p> <p>The total amount of water exported by month in each water year type for each action alternative is presented in Appendix 5A, BDCP EIR/EIS Modeling Technical Appendix, of the Final EIR/EIS, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Model Results, of the EIR/EIS. As shown in Appendix 5A, Section C, 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.</p>
1178	1	Please say no to the Delta tunnels project. We must protect the Bay Delta ecosystem.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>
1179	1	<p>Another technological fix on nature is not the way to go. To save water, to maximize the capture of water where it falls, we need to do it at a steady, dependable way, as the Earth has built humus since the dawn of dirt. Allan Savory's Holistic Management, Joel Salatin's farming methods, the films "Soil Carbon Cowboys" and "Back to Eden" and more describe the rapid building of humus via imitations of nature. Humus is the home of organisms and the sponge that traps water where it lands. That Earth's structure came about via nature. To destroy what has occurred over eons of time in favor of a temporary, damaging fix is just wrong!</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Since the late 1800s, the Bay-Delta ecosystem has been substantially altered. Changes in key environmental attributes of the Bay-Delta have contributed to the current degraded state of the ecosystem and appear to be proximate causes of declines in desired fishes and increases in non-native species. California WaterFix is not intended to address all the factors that have contributed to the Delta's decline and briefly summarizes a few but not all of those factors. Many factors that have contributed to the decline of the Delta's ecosystem including the conversion of tidal marsh and floodplains to farmland, construction of levees and altering of tide flows, in-Delta and upstream water diversions, contaminant discharges, ammonia and nutrient discharges and changes to the food web, increases in water temperatures, and introduction of non-native and invasive species. The Delta will remain in a highly altered state for the foreseeable future and the project is not intended to address all the past harms or restore the Delta to a pre-altered state.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is intended to provide a more reliable water supply, with diversions that are more protective for fish, in accordance with the Delta Reform Act co-equal goals of improving water supply reliability and Delta ecosystem health. The premise of the California WaterFix is that it will provide environmental benefits while stabilizing water supplies for a large population of California residents, consistent with statutory policy as found in the Delta Reform Act of 2009 (see, e.g., California Public Resources Code, §§ 85001(c), 85002, 85004(a), 85020.) Refer to Master Response 31 (Compliance with the Delta Reform Act).</p> <p>It is important to note, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 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.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
1180	1	<p>Let the fish and wildlife live. Let them be! Can you see the problem is not water it is too many people using what we have: more every day!</p> <p>The true and only solution is a declining human population, not more farmland, endangered wildlife or tunnels designed to rearrange nature.</p> <p>Please stop tinkering and scheming, please.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1181	1	<p>Not a fix! Stop the fracking and it will save millions of gallons of water. Make the oil companies cut back on their water usage, don't kill our habitat.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.</p> <p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to 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. o further response is necessary.</p>
1182	1	Please stop this project and let the almond and other nut trees die.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1183	1	<p>The best fix is to leave the water in the Delta where it belongs in the first place! In this drought, why is it okay to ship water for almonds in the Westlands district when there was no water there to begin with?</p> <p>Protect the earth for once, not your pocketbook.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p>
1184	1	Please look at the overall impact and make decisions that will benefit our grandchildren and there children. No short term "fixes"!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1185	1	Sending water to a region that will use it for swimming pools and golf courses is wasteful at best. Years from now we'll look back on actions like this and think the decision makers were insane!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to stipulated beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows. The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) could modify water permits to balance and</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>protect beneficial uses of water.</p>
1186	1	<p>As a biologist and California citizen, I am opposed to this diversion of water, as I was with the Peripheral Canal years ago. It is destructive of our water resources and will only benefit corporate agriculture, harm citizens and specific of Northern California, and harm the environment.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the 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. For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.</p> <p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.</p>
1187	1	<p>The benefits of the Delta tunnels project are way fewer than the damage it would cause as well as the cost. Please do not permit this project to progress.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Please see the BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report (http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/Draft_BDCP_Statewide_Economic_Impact_Report_8-5-13.sflb.ashx), which indicates that the BDCP would result in a substantial net economic benefit to the State of California. An updated cost/benefit analysis is currently being conducted for the current preferred Alternative, 4A.</p>
1188	1	<p>California has much more to offer the world besides almonds and pistachios, much more precious resources which this project will irrevocably destroy. Please think deeply about this.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1189	1	Southern California has to find other sources of water and stop taking from the north.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management.</p>
1190	1	<p>We don't need to increase agriculture in these areas.</p> <p>Salmon are an endangered species and must be protected from big business and their terrible ethics.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The 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.</p>
1191	1	This is where animals live and people play, don't take it away!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1192	1	Please consider the long term effects on the animals and species that rely on this habitat.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
1193	1	I believe this is a bad idea for Californians. I live in Sacramento and would hate to see any less water in our American and Sacramento Rivers, which have been devastated by the drought. It is unfair to divert this water for high intensity crops and make the rest of the citizens and businesses suffer. We rely on the American River for the salmon who head up toward Folsom Dam to spawn.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). The proposed project would not increase the amount of water to which SWP and CVP hold water rights for use allowed under their contracts and permits and approvals for refuge water supplies or other environmental purposes.</p>
1194	1	The drought may end, or this may be the new normal, but we can't erase ecosystem damage. Species diversity may never recover. Please plan for the long term.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
1195	1	California should be only growing water-wise crops.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1196	1	Leave the Delta alone! Change the way agriculture waters instead! There is no reason they water while the sun is up! It's a huge waste of water. They could use a lot less water if they only watered out food crops multiple times after the sun goes down. It's how I water my garden and all of my organic crops do great with evening non-stressful watering.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via proposed conveyance facilities.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1197	1	<p>The water must stay where nature intended it to be. Do not play God.</p> <p>Leave the Delta as is. Other areas should deal with their problems without stealing water from the Delta. Why create more problems that will arise? Wrong, wrong, wrong.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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 amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the 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/S.</p>
1198	1	<p>Big agriculture wastes a tremendous amount [of] water. Instead, we need to produce agriculture sustainably and organically! UC Davis has demonstrated that organic food can produce just as much food as conventional but with tremendous sustainable benefits. We are in this water crisis because of the waste and abuse of water by big agriculture [and] big oil. Currently, aquifers are being used as dumping grounds for toxic fracking waste.</p> <p>This is ultimate abuse of our limited resources. Crises occur because of greed and unfortunately Californians are suffering from corporate abuse. We need smart organic farming, not continuing down the destructive conventional big agriculture abuse. There is no excuse but just plain greed as science has demonstrated [that] in order to feed the world we must grow sustainable organic food.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The 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. 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. The proposed project does not propose any changes to existing agricultural practices.</p>
1198	2	<p>As for energy, we have enough energy in the sky for the next 5 billion years. In one hour [as] the sun hits planet Earth enough energy is produced for everyone on the planet for an entire year. There is another unlimited energy source, which is producing gas in the United Kingdom. A plant which costs a mere 18 million dollars (the price of a house in California) is able to produce energy for 2 million people via conversion of human waste into biomethane.</p> <p>Cities could produce their own sustainable energy by utilizing their sewage plants. Ideally, we could utilize sewage waste to provide energy to generators to operate solar energy 24/7, on demand, for everyone.</p> <p>Vehicles should be electric with use of solar and wind (resistance) which is unlimited when driving. Solutions are available and highly profitable; we just need greed to work in a positive direction which provides benefit instead of destruction. Get greedy with roof top solar energy! Get greedy with organic food production. It's a no brainer; the market demonstrates consumer demand with trillions just waiting for the taking. Get greedy with roof top solar energy! Get greedy with sustainable organic food production!</p>	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of other potential energy project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p>
1199	1	<p>Big corporations, we are told, create jobs. Big farms that grow water-intensive crops, we are, told create jobs. But who will seek for the wildlife that nature created? Are you/we just going to slowly kill off the planet's ecosystem? Remember, we are all hurtling through space on [what] is in reality a speck of dust.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Your God is angry with us.	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. No further response is necessary.