

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1300	1	Let's get started on desalinization! Ocean rising won't miss 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>For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.</p>
1301	1	California needs to seriously consider massive water desalination plants in order to increase fresh water supplies.	<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>For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.</p>
1302	1	This is a bad idea. Please invest in conservation, recycling and desalination instead.	<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 refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Additionally, please refer to Master Response 7 for information on desalination and why it was not included as a project alternative.</p>
1303	1	We need a more pragmatic solution to water needs: desalination projects, water recovery systems, etc.	<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 refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Additionally, please refer to Master Response 7 for information on desalination and why it was not included as a project alternative.</p>
1304	1	It's time for California to stop trying to use 20th century solutions to solve 21st century problems. There is no guarantee that the tunnels will be able to provide sufficient water to Southern California given climate change patterns. But we do know that that the tunnels stand a good chance of harming a delicately balanced ecosystem in the Delta.	<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 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			purpose and need behind the proposed project.
1304	2	It's time to start looking at desalinization and other solutions that can be targeted to the specific location.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
1305	1	<p>My purpose in writing this communication is to vehemently oppose the construction of the twin tunnels designed to divert water from the rivers that supply the Delta area.</p> <p>I have been a resident of Stockton for forty two years now and have come to realize the vital importance of the agricultural and environmental needs supplied by the water from the Sacramento, American, Mokelumne, San Joaquin, Calaveras and other rivers that enter into the Delta region of Northern California.</p> <p>My childhood and early adult years were spent in the Los Angeles area. While I realize that the larger number of people live in Southern California compared to Northern California I feel that diverting the water supply from Northern California to the Southern part of the state is not the right answer to the problem of supplying Southern California. This plan would irreversibly harm the agriculture of our area which supplies a large portion of food products for the entire nation.</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. Senior water rights holders are not affected by implementation of action alternatives. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation would be able to pump from the proposed 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 adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S.</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, Water Demand Management).</p>
1305	2	<p>Southern California needs to conserve water as much as possible instead of watering golf courses, millions of swimming pools and lawns and wasting water. I have seen water flowing in the concrete "flood basins" of the Los Angeles River even during summer months.</p> <p>Please consider other alternatives to the twin tunnel project.</p>	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change with continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).
1306	1	I say a BIG NO!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1307	1	<p>Dear Secretary Laird,</p> <p>In your October 6, 2015 reply to the Congressional Representatives, you declined to extend the comment period for review of the California WaterFix environmental document.</p>	The time periods provided for public review and comment of the environmental documents for the proposed project were consistent with the requirements of CEQA and NEPA. CEQA and NEPA generally require a 45-day public review period of a draft EIR or EIS, respectively. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15105, subd. (a), 15087, subd. (e); 40 C.F.R. §1506.10(c).) The lead agencies may, but need not, extend the review period. (40 C.F.R. § 1506.10(d).) The CEQA Guidelines provide, however, that the public review period on a draft EIR should not be longer than 60 days "except under unusual circumstances." (CEQA Guidelines, § 15105, subd. (a).) The comment period for the RDEIR/SDEIS was extended by 60 days. Please see Master Response 39 for more information about the public review period.
1307	2	<p>I ask that you please give serious consideration to immediately withdrawing the California WaterFix RDEIR/SDEIS as well as the petition to the SWRCB [State Water Resources Control Board] and Clean Water Act applications.</p> <p>The current California WaterFix proposal will not contribute to achieving the coequal goals or solving the serious and urgent problems of the Delta ecosystem and California's water supply reliability. Worse still, WaterFix will actually hinder achievement of these coequal</p>	DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. The project objectives and purposes as outlined in Chapter 2 of the FEIR/FEIS, Purpose and Need, comply with CEQA and NEPA, and are sufficiently broad, and appropriately reflect the State of California's intention to advance the coequal goals set forth in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Reform Act of 2009 by providing a more reliable water supply for California, reducing effects of the project on state and federally listed species and improving the Delta ecosystem. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving , timing

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		goals.	<p>designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>For more on the project’s purpose and need, please see Master Response 3.</p>
1307	3	<p>Allowing the export contractors to pay for the BDCP and WaterFix planning efforts has meant that a project of California-wide and national importance has only focused on what are essentially only two alternatives that would only benefit export water quality and fails to even increase export water supplies.</p> <p>Because the export contractors control spending on the environmental review process, and the existing budget was pretty much spent, the RDEIR/SDEIS was released with no new modeling and only brief sensitivity analyses. As a result, the RDEIR/SDEIS is inadequate for use by decision makers such as the SWRCB [State Water Resources Control Board], U.S. Army Corps or even the lead agencies. The Delta ISB [Independent Science Board] in its latest comments on the RDEIR/SDEIS found that presentation of the impact analyses is also inadequate and hides actual impacts from decision makers. This is not what the Natural Resources Agency should be helping to support and rush through.</p> <p>It is important that you, as a key decision maker, understand the serious problems with the current WaterFix proposal and the model analyses and environmental documents that were supposed to support that proposal.</p>	<p>As noted by the commenter, the RDEIR/SDEIS analysis for Alternative 4A utilized available modeling of Alternative 4 H3 and H4 at ELT. Impact determinations in the RDEIR/SDEIS were not inadequate. Rather, the impact analyses were based on thorough review of the modeling available, as well as applicable sensitivity analyses, and were made based on experience and professional judgment. Where the modeling showed differences from the alternative definitions, explanations for expected differences in the data evaluated were included to explain this professional judgment that was applied.</p> <p>For the Final EIR/S, the modeling for Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A was updated to remove the tidal habitat restoration and Yolo Bypass enhancements, to include Emmaton as the compliance location, and include operation of the Montezuma Slough Salinity Control Gate. Final EIR/S appendices supporting Chapter 5, Water Supply, and Chapter 8, Water Quality, have been revised to show the updated modeling results. The Final EIR/EIS includes model results for Alternatives 2D, 4A, and 5A at ELT conditions as compared to the No Action Alternative at ELT conditions and compared to Existing Conditions. The results are presented in Appendix 5A, Section C, in addition to the model results previously provided in the Draft EIR/EIS. Based on the results of the updated modeling, the impact conclusions presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS were confirmed, as presented in the Final EIR/S.</p> <p>For additional information regarding modeling, please also see Master Response 30. For responses to comments related to the Delta Independent Science Board’s letters, please refer to comment letters BDCP 1448 and/or RECIRC 2546.</p>
1307	4	<p>A detailed analysis of the flawed RDEIR/SDEIS modeling data indicates that the project would actually increase exports during the driest months when Delta outflows are very low and the Delta ecosystem is most stressed. The modeling data also indicates that the Army Corps limits on inflows to Clifton Court would be regularly exceeded. The RDEIR/SDEIS and the Army Corps application make no mention of this. Reverse flows in the south Delta are not minimized as the public outreach claims and remain significantly reversed (OMR [Old and Middle River] < -2,000 cfs [cubic feet per second]) 55% of the time. The water quality impact analyses for the RDEIR/SDEIS were unexplainably performed for late long-term (2060) conditions rather than early long-term (2025). As a result, the greater amount of seawater intrusion (at 2060) masks the actual WaterFix impacts on water quality.</p>	<p>The Final EIR/EIS includes model results for Alternatives 2D, 4A, and 5A at ELT conditions as compared to the No Action Alternative at ELT conditions and compared to Existing Conditions. The results are presented in Appendix 5A, Section C, in addition to the model results previously provided in the Draft EIR/EIS. The comparative results between Alternatives 2D, 4A, and 5A and the No Action Alternative and the Existing Conditions are generally consistent with the impact analysis results presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS. Under the Proposed Project (Alternative 4A), the model assumptions maintained the existing diversion limits at Clifton Court Forebay per the USACE agreements; and export of up to 10,300 cfs of SWP water in the wetter months is based upon conveyance through the Banks Pumping Plant of water diverted at the north and south Delta intakes.</p> <p>As shown in Appendix 5A, Section C, annual total Delta exports for SWP and CVP would increase in wet, above normal, and below normal years; be similar under dry years; and decrease under critical dry years under Alternative 4A as compared to the No Action Alternative. Overall, total Delta exports would be similar or greater in December through July and less from August through November under Alternative 4A as compared to the No Action Alternative.</p> <p>As described in Appendix 5A of the EIR/EIS, the numerical models cannot be used in a predictive manner to define absolute values. Rather, they must be used in a comparative manner to indicate overall changes between alternatives as compared to the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative. As shown in Appendix 5A, Section C, the Old and Middle River flows under Alternative 4A would be more positive than under the No Action Alternative and Existing Conditions except in April and May except in wet years. The model results indicate that in these months, the increased reverse Old and Middle River flows would range from approximately -119 to -427 cfs under Alternative 4A as compared to the No Action Alternative, and from approximately -72 to -748 cfs as compared to the Existing Conditions which includes the effects due to climate change and sea level rise. The purpose and need of the proposed project was to minimize the effects</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1307	5	The flawed "brief sensitivity analyses" done to support the RDEIR/SDEIS still show a strong dependence on exports from the south Delta, despite the construction of very expensive new intakes in the north Delta. Strangely, a recently posted WaterFix animation proudly states that most of the exports during dry years will be from the south Delta, i.e., when the Delta is most stressed.	<p>of the action alternatives as compared to the No Action Alternative, and not to eliminate reverse flows.</p> <p>Implementing the conveyance facilities would help resolve many of the concerns with the current south Delta conveyance system, and would help reduce threats to endangered and threatened species in the Delta, including entrainment at south Delta export facilities. For instance, implementing a dual conveyance system would align water operations, and their location, to better reflect natural seasonal flow patterns by creating new water diversions in the north Delta equipped with State-of-the-art fish screens, thus reducing reliance on south Delta exports during times of the year when listed aquatic species are present and most vulnerable.</p> <p>Alternatives 1 through 9, as presented in the DEIR/DEIS and the RDEIR/SDEIS, assume use of a portion of Sacramento River inflow to maintain south Delta water quality in summer months. In the Final EIR/EIS, the CALSIM II model code was modified to simulate the proposed project, Alternative 4A, to explicitly provide a preference for use of the south Delta intakes for up to 3,000 cfs during July through September to minimize potential water quality degradation in the south Delta channels.</p> <p>As presented in Appendix 5A, Section C, exports through the south Delta intakes would be substantially decreased in wet through dry years and similar in critical dry years. Overall, total Delta exports increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years.</p>
1307	6	There are many other problems with the RDEIR/SDEIS and too much time will be wasted if you wait till the end of the comment period, and review of yet another round of comment letters, before realizing that WaterFix is way off track.	<p>The Proposed Project is the result of more than seven years' collaboration and consultation with numerous stakeholders, agencies, public water agencies and environmental organizations. The organizations that have participated in the Steering Committee, public meetings or written letters to provide input on the Plan include, among others: American Rivers, Bay Institute, Defenders of Wildlife, The Endangered Species Coalition, Environmental Defense Fund, The Golden Gate Salmon Association, National Audubon Society, Natural Resources Defense Council, the Nature Conservancy, and Planning and Conservation League. The feedback was used to guide the development and subsequent revisions of the Proposed Project and its associated EIR/EIS to reflect concerns addressed from the various groups.</p> <p>The State is most interested in putting forth the best project that meets the goals of ecosystem improvement and water supply reliability. The fact that the current proposed project is endorsed by some environmental organizations serves as confirmation that the proposed project would protect species, habitats and the Delta ecosystem in a way that is compatible with the existing regulatory goals.</p>
1307	7	The 2009 Delta Reform Act requires that the SWRCB [State Water Resources Control Board] develop new Delta flow criteria before BDCP can be approved. Strong legal arguments in support of this statutory requirement are laid out in the September 29 letter from NRDC [National Resources Defense Council] et al. to Tom Howard. BDCP Alternative 8 and WaterFix Alternative 4H3 demonstrate that the preferred alternative infrastructure will not be viable with these necessary increased flow requirements. Once the SWRCB sets new flow requirements, the north Delta intakes and twin tunnels would become a very expensive stranded asset.	<p>As described in Chapter 6, Surface Water, of the EIR/EIS, the State Water Resources Control Board is conducting a current program to update the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan. Since this program is still under development and the potential outcomes are not known at this time, this program is not included in the analysis. Following completion of the updated Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan, SWP and CVP operations would need to be reviewed to determine if the operations continued to comply with the new regulations.</p> <p>As described in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives Conservation Measure 1, of the EIR/EIS, one of the potential alternatives considered was based upon the State Water Resources Control Board 2010 Development of Flow Criteria for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Ecosystem, which described providing up to 75 percent of unimpaired flow into the Delta to improve aquatic resources habitat conditions. This potential alternative was not evaluated in detail because the flow recommendations in the 2010 report could not be achieved without adverse impacts to cold water management for fisheries in the Sacramento, Feather, and American rivers without reductions in non-SWP and non-CVP water rights diversions. The purpose and need of this EIR/EIS would not allow changes to non-SWP and non-CVP water rights. However, Alternatives 7 and 8 in the EIR/EIS reflect similar flow criteria in a manner that would only affect SWP and CVP water rights.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1307	8	<p>The Natural Resources Agency and DWR must reclaim their leadership role and responsibility to protect Delta water resources and the Delta ecosystem. As outlined in the California Water Action Plan, there are more viable alternatives that need to be considered that incorporate new storage and conveyance to capture and store water during periods of high Delta flow, allow increased Delta flows in all months for fish, as well as actions to reduce water demand and increase local water supply reliability. These alternatives must be given serious consideration, and as soon as possible.</p>	<p>Commenter identifies other actions that may provide additional benefit for the State's water problems. The solution to the State's water problem is multi-faceted and will include multiple actions throughout the state. Ways to reduce demand are in process at this time. Various programs for storage, reuse and added reliability are being evaluated and implemented. Those actions do not provide the entire solution; therefore, the project is being proposed as one of the pieces of the overall program. Please see Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures in the final EIR/EIS and Master Response 6 (Demand Management) for additional information.</p> <p>However, neither the State nor Federal government have the authority to dictate action by the various water entities. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1307	9	<p>The WaterFix proposal would harm rather than improve the Delta ecosystem and fails to provide any significant increase in water supply reliability. Contrary to State and Federal statutes (2009 Delta Reform Act, Public Law 112-74), it fails to contribute to achieving either of the coequal goals.</p> <p>The situation in the Delta ecosystem is dire and an effective sustainable solution is needed now. As Interior Deputy Secretary, Michael Connor, said in the September 30 press release regarding the new report on "Challenges facing the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta," we must adopt bold, new approaches and any necessary water infrastructure improvements should be accompanied by a portfolio of actions such as water conservation and efficiency measures, habitat improvements, and improved groundwater management and storage.</p>	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. New facilities will allow for greater operational flexibility. For more information regarding the proposed project's compliance with the Delta Reform Act, please see Master Response 31 and Appendix 3J, Alternative 4A (Proposed Project), Compliance with the 2009 Delta Reform Act.</p> <p>As mentioned above, 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. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well.</p>
1307	10	<p>Just because the BDCP proponents have spent \$250 million on the BDCP and WaterFix planning and environmental documents, and have "put a million hours into it" (Governor Brown, May 6, 2015), does not mean that WaterFix has not gone seriously off track. The last nine years have been largely wasted, with no meaningful stakeholder participation since 2010. It is not too late to do the right thing.</p> <p>It is time to acknowledge "the emperor has no clothes," and invite wide-spread stakeholder involvement in developing a real solution, one that actually achieves both coequal goals.</p>	<p>The comment suggests that additional stakeholder involvement is needed to identify an alternative that meets the coequal goals. Alternative 4 was modified, and subalternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A were developed, in part, in response to public and agency input following issuance of the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Additional stakeholder outreach has been conducted through the public review process for the 2015 RDEIR and SDEIS. The public review process for both CEQA and NEPA environmental documents are part of the process of getting input from stakeholders. For more information regarding public outreach efforts, please see Master Response 40 (Public Outreach).</p> <p>DWR staff has made best efforts to try to maintain contact with interested citizens. In 2013, DWR staff and the public outreach team conducted a series of "Delta Office Hours" in communities throughout the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. In many instances, attendees had questions outside the scope of the BDCP that staff committed to following up on. Such comments and questions were recorded and DWR staff attempted to follow up with participants. In some circumstances, such as where DWR staff was being unable to identify whom to follow up with when participants met in small groups, DWR staff was not able to follow-up with all participants. Contact information for the DWR Landowner Liaison was provided to all participants, and was made available online for any Delta Landowners to contact outside of the scheduled office hours.</p> <p>All of the documents, studies, administrative drafts and meeting materials – more than 3,000 documents in total, have also been posted online in an unprecedented commitment to public access and government transparency. Further, the proposed project raised the standard for proactive outreach and engagement with communities and the public overall by efforts such as establishing a multilingual toll-free phone line for questions which includes information in Spanish, Tagalog, Vietnamese and Chinese (Mandarin) in addition to English, providing translators upon request to respond to requests, and having a Spanish-language translator at every open house public meeting on the Draft EIR/EIS among other efforts.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Ultimately, Alternative 4 was modified, and non-HCP Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A were developed, in part, in response to public and agency input following issuance of the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Additional stakeholder outreach has been conducted through the public review process for the 2015 RDEIR and SDEIS. The public review process for both CEQA and NEPA environmental documents are part of the process of getting input from stakeholders. Please see Master Response 40 for more information on the Public Outreach efforts and Master Response 42 for information on how stakeholder comments were addressed.
1307	11	No one wants the Delta smelt or any other of the key fish species to go extinct on their watch.	The comment is acknowledged. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1307	12	Detailed graphs of the WaterFix sensitivity analysis data and other useful documents that highlight serious problems with the WaterFix proposal can be found on the SWRCB WaterFix petition page: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/california_waterfix/early_petition_comments/	As mentioned above, the Final EIR/EIS includes model results for Alternatives 2D, 4A, and 5A as compared to the No Action Alternative and Existing Conditions in Appendix 5A, Section C, in addition to the model results previously provided in the Draft EIR/EIS. The comparative results between Alternatives 2D, 4A, and 5A and the No Action Alternative and the Existing Conditions are generally consistent with the impact analysis results presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS. The commenter does not identify any particular deficiencies with the environmental analysis for the proposed project.
1308	1	Governor Brown, I thought you sent a delegation to Australia last October to learn a few things about water use and conservation? Wasn't it helpful? Are the big influential guns too powerful in this humungous state for wisdom to prevail? Take paradise...and put up a vacuum to vacate it? Bottom line for tomorrow is disaster for 30 years out.	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. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1309	1	Why should cities in the south of California deserve the water which is rained and needed by Northern California? Do you really think they would give us their water?	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. For a discussion of purpose and need of the California WaterFix, please refer to Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need.
1310	1	While it is unfortunate that much of Central and Southern California have been developed as urban and agricultural centers without adequate sources of water, diverting water from Northern California is not a solution. Experts on climate change are projecting that snow packs in the Sierra will be substantially reduced in the future due to climate change. Northern California is suffering a serious drought. Current water laws require that water be diverted to southern parts of the state irrespective of fluctuations in water supply (rain and snow pack). The proposed tunnel project will further drain Northern California of its water.	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. 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. 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).
1310	2	<p>The Bay-Delta is an irreplaceable resource which will suffer additional damage should the tunnels be built.</p> <p>This drought year (2015) has already taken a serious toll on fish species and other aquatic plants and animals, and the tunnels will only do further damage. Please do not approve the Delta tunnel project.</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>
1310	3	It's time to eliminate water hungry landscapes and agriculture in the southern regions of the state which do not have the snow pack or rainfall to sustain them.	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 beneficial use.
1311	1	Please choose a beneficial alternative instead of the California Water Fix.	<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 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. The 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>
1312	1	<p>The idea of diverting more water from an already drought-ridden region is insane. We can live without almonds. We can live without pistachios. We can't keep selling our water rights to big businesses and expect to maintain any semblance of a stable environment here.</p> <p>This is a critical issue. Protection of our water table is my top priority in how I vote come Election Day.</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>
1313	1	<p>The impact of current structure in place to transfer water from the Delta to other parts of California has a negative ecological impact.</p> <p>The new plan would worsen the situation. Let us learn from past mistakes and not repeat them, making short term political achievements at the expense of long term development needs.</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 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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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>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>
1314	1	<p>Our water belongs to the Delta and the Bay and the living systems that depend upon it, not to agribusiness in the desert.</p> <p>Stop the Delta tunnels.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Providing regulatory oversight to oil companies or large agribusiness is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34(Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>
1315	1	<p>Governor Brown has sold out Northern California to corporate farmers, greedy rapers of the earth's underground natural water systems, and the heavily rural fire protection agencies.</p> <p>More Northern water for pesticide GMO monster motivated companies. No regulation on ancient natural aquifers being totally drained [even in bountiful rain years] to avoid paying for water his father sent south; causing their collapse, never to be an active emergency source of water again. Making rural property owners to pay a fee [\$150], which goes to administration instead of firefighters fighting fires. Jerry, you sold us all out big time.</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>
1316	1	<p>Trashing the natural environment only exacerbates the problems. Please find a more reasonable and sustainable way of solving California's water shortages.</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>
1317	1	<p>Water intensive crops, food grown for livestock, and livestock raising should be eliminated as a poor use of our water in these drought times!</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>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>
1318	1	<p>The tunnel project will be a disaster for the Sacramento Delta, the bay, and California generally, promoting wasteful use of fresh water, which will become increasingly scarce with climate change. We must not even consider such an irresponsible project.</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.</p> <p>The EIR/EIS modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the project, climate change and rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta, reduce snow fall which will reduce stream flows in late spring and summer, and affect ecosystems in the future as compared to Existing Conditions, as described in the resource chapters in the EIR/EIS. These changes will occur with or without the proposed project. The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us, including climate change and sea level rise. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/.</p>
1319	1	<p>Such a drastic, destructive plan must be avoided. The Delta simply cannot remain ecologically viable if you allow this misguided project to proceed.</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>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1320	1	We need the river to flow to support salmon runs. Stop the California water fix.	<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>
1321	1	Leave the Delta alone. The shortest path between two points in California is the one that does not destroy precious things.	<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 Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
1322	1	You will destroy the Delta with this project that will need twice as much money as projected and take longer than mentioned. Please do not embark on this ridiculous water grab for water that won't even be there for the taking.	<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>By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. The proposed project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports). Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water) and Master Response 5 (Cost).</p>
1323	1	It is critical that there be no Delta Tunnels Project! There must be no further diversions of water from the San Francisco watershed!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the EIR/EIS discloses the potential water quality impacts resulting from constructing and operating the proposed project. See also Master Response 14 (Water Quality).</p>
1324	1	I am writing to express my opposition to the Delta Tunnels project and to ask you to not permit the project. The environmental harm it would cause outweighs the gain and a sounder longer range solution must be sought.	<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 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 Clean Water Act federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental.</p>
1325	1	Peripheral canal...peripheral tunnels...a scam by any name is a scam...the delta and it's fish must survive.	<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 36 (Peripheral Canal).</p>
1326	1	<p>The first priority of the government is to make certain its working and middle-class constituents have plenty of water to live comfortably.</p> <p>It is not government's place or right to use water to placate its wealthy corporate donors! Vote No on the Delta tunnel project and all similar corporate kick-back giveaways!</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>
1327	1	Preserve our resources our children's future depends on 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 comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1328	1	These proposed tunnels are a tremendous waste of water--something that is in extremely short supply currently! We need to cut back on agricultural uses of water that are not necessary and fine other foods, fruits and nuts that don't take all of our water! We have to preserve the levels on our rivers so that the fish and other aquatic creatures can live!	<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. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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> <p>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>
1329	1	Tunnels will become part of the problem, not the solution to our water issues. No to the Delta Tunnels 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>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the preferred alternative is intended to be not detrimental to the environment. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the alternative is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>
1330	1	These tunnels won't solve our water shortage. It looks to most of us like "catastrophe politics" - taking advantage of an emergency to push through unwise and unpopular policies that only appeal to a certain constituency.	<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. 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, Water Demand Management).</p>
1331	1	I live 5 minutes away from the Delta. Please preserve and protect this 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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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>
1332	1	<p>Moving vast amounts of Northern California to the south is not the remedy for our water challenges. This will only subject the Sacramento River and San Francisco Bay Delta and Estuary to further degradation.</p> <p>No to the massive twin tunnels!</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>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.</p>
1333	1	<p>This is not the way to begin to be sane about the allocations of the commons - our birthright.</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>
1334	1	<p>This is an outrage. Time for Southern California to practice conservation, desalination, responsible growth, good practice and policies.</p> <p>Let northern California manage its own resources appropriately without interference. We need the water that is here to manage our natural resources. Hands off. Be a good neighbor. The preservation of the north state is a benefit to us all.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project 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. Appendix 1C of the Final EIR/EIS, Demand Management Measures, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. Refer to Master Response 6 for more information on demand management. Although components such as desalination plants and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the State, they are beyond the scope of the project. Also, please see Master Response 4 for details on the selection of alternatives. Additionally, please refer to Master Response 7 for information on desalination and why it was not included as a project</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			alternative and Master Response 35 regarding Southern California Water Supply.
1335	1	We humans are not the only ones that need this water. Ironically, we will suffer as the surrounding ecology fades and dies. Please try to see the big picture.	<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>
1336	1	The "California Water Fix" is not a long term viable solution for the water needs of our state. This short-sighted and environmentally harmful development would devastate the ecosystem, while industrial agriculture would be given water instead of becoming more sustainable in practice. This is a complete step backwards, please do not pass 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>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. 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.</p>
1337	1	I oppose any land-development that alters the ecology and fragile environment in the State of California. Wildlife will be affected! We should not alter or change the delicate 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>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>
1338	1	This is where I've lived my whole life, and I'm sick of it being destroyed by greed! I want my clean ocean and sky back 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.</p>
1339	1	Please protect the Bay-Delta ecosystem; it is always the right time to do the right thing!	<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 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>
1340	1	<p>This destructive siphoning off of the Sacramento River Delta will kill salmon, divert water to Southern California to grow alfalfa and almonds in the desert, and ruin the entire ecosystem in the SF Bay and Sacramento Delta.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
1341	1	<p>We could do without almonds for a while.</p> <p>Almond farmers could be compensated some what for their losses more inexpensively than the tunnelling.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via proposed conveyance facilities.</p>
1342	1	<p>For me, it is very important for the Delta Tunnels decision makers to take a deep breath and look at the extreme ramifications and consequences the Tunnels will cause. Please sit down, remove all of your political aspirations from your thoughts, and see just how much damage the Tunnels will cause in NorCal.</p> <p>Among many of the obvious reasons already discussed to oppose the Tunnels, there is the lack of responsibility for SoCal to create other water sources. If 'healthier water' is the reason, SoCal needs to be responsible for their own growth and water needs and make plans for the answers that does not ruin NorCal people, farmers, environment, public health, and economics.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p>
1342	2	<p>The loss of farm land, fish and game, and a total loss of food source (NorCal will be left with salt water) are among a small portion of the consequences.</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. 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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
1342	3	This Tunnel projects ruins generations of family lives, jobs, etc. It is time SoCal works on solutions using SoCal resources. I strongly urge you to vote no!	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. As described in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, under Alternative 4, Impact ECON-1, construction employment is estimated to peak at 2,427 FTE jobs in year 3. Total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) would peak in year 12, at 8,673 FTE jobs. Direct agricultural employment would be reduced by an estimated 16 FTE jobs, while total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) associated with agricultural employment would fall by 57 FTE jobs. Based on the crop production values changes described in Impact ECON-6 for construction effects, the direct agricultural job losses would more likely be concentrated in the vegetable, truck, orchard, and vineyard crop sectors, which are relatively labor intensive, than in the grain, field, and forage crop sectors, where more jobs are mechanized.
1343	1	No. Communities, wildlife, and the environment will not benefit from this project. We oppose the Delta Tunnels Project. Diverting water in a drought stricken state is just wrong!	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. 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 it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental.
1344	1	Food grows where water flows! Our farmers need our water.	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. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. In its efforts to achieve the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration, the California WaterFix seeks to protect dozens of species of fish and wildlife in the Delta while also securing reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California. Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed California WaterFix.
1345	1	It doesn't seem right to damage one region of God's creation to change another. People should learn to live in harmony with nature without harming others.	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. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1346	1	This new try to grab Northern California water for use by Big Agribusiness is pathetic. They tried to grab it before via the Peripheral Canal promoted by Jerry Brown so this is the same attempt headed by the same Jerry Brown.	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		It is criminal that big money and population numbers can destroy a vital part of California. to benefit mainly out of staters.	<p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>A number of important improvements have been made to set the current proposal apart from the Peripheral Canal. For instance, tunnels are proposed to reduce surface impacts associated with canals. The capacity of the Proposed Project is more than 10,000 cfs smaller than the Peripheral Canal. The project as proposed allows for dual conveyance allowing through-Delta operations to continue in order to maintain in-Delta water quality. The Proposed Project would require operation of the proposed new in-Delta portions of the CVP and SWP pursuant to environmentally stringent rules under the Federal Endangered Species Act and California Endangered Species Act.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7 regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage.</p>
1347	1	This argument was settled with the Peripheral Canal vote. We are not going to fight this battle again. Thank you for reading my letter.	<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>Master Response 26 explains how the California WaterFix Project is different from the previously proposed Peripheral Canal. The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats.</p>
1348	1	While it might seem like a good thing, taking more water up stream in the Delta will not only endanger the health of the bay but also the land down stream. Without the fresh water more salt water can move up the delta and destroy farmland. His isn't a good solution to our water problems.	<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. The EIR/S modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.</p>
1349	1	Tunnels will destroy what's left of the Delta. We have to change our agricultural products. Almonds never should have been planted in such large numbers.	<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. 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.</p>
1350	1	Please do not cave to the agribusiness lobby in favor of the longer term need of the majority of us to have intact ecosystems. The history of the Sacramento Delta should warn us against	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
		this euphemistic water fix.	<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>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>
1351	1	We are all in the California water mess together. No more state money for special interests.	<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>
1352	1	These would completely destroy the efforts to restore and protect the Delta and in the San Francisco Bay. A boon to almond and pistachio growers, a boondoggle for all the rest of us!	<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 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
1353	1	My brother worked hard for many years to defeat the Peripheral Canal. I don't want the natural area he worked so hard to protect to be destroyed by monstrous underground 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>Master Response 36 explains how the California WaterFix Project is different from the previously proposed Peripheral Canal. The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats.</p>
1354	1	The Delta tunnel proposal is an obsolete monolith from the last century.	<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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Please abandon it and look to a modern solution: tap the enormous potential for generating more water for the Central Valley and the South by conservation measures.	<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>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. Although conservation components and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including storm water drainage. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California’s water resources. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
1356	1	<p>Protecting the Delta and the San Francisco Bay downstream is critical to maintain the already threatened region's ecology and endangered species. The twin tunnels idea is just a drop in the bucket and diverts water to purposes that are not priority, nor should they be. This project has virtually no merit whatsoever and should not go forward.</p> <p>The money it would cost could well be better spent on a more viable solution to the state's water crisis.</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 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, Water Demand Management).</p>
1357	1	This is definitely not a water fix! This will cause severe damage to the Delta, indigenous and migratory fish and the entire Delta ecology will be negatively and irreparably impacted. No tunnels!!!	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the

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>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>
1358	1	Please do not build the tunnels. The Delta should not be put at risk because Los Angeles was built in a desert.	<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 Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).</p>
1359	1	You have got to be kidding, this project is an ecological disaster. Do not approve it as I will devote as many resources as possible to fight this train wreck.	<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>
1360	1	The Delta Tunnels plan is a bad idea considering the fragility of the Delta and the environmental damage that it will cause. This will also be a taxpayer's nightmare and cannot be allowed to go forward. We stopped the Peripheral Canal and we will stop this boondoggle as well.	<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 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 36 (Peripheral Canal).
1361	1	Please protect the environment and stop large corporate farming operations from taking our crucial water supply.	<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. Senior water rights holders are not affected by implementation of action alternatives. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation would be able to pump from the proposed 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 adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S.</p>
1362	1	<p>Once again, a totally outrageous idea that would have devastating effects on the environment and the animals! Not to mention the outrageous price this would be. When are you going to put in place permanent underground reservoirs that would solve the problem forever - and would be very kind to the environment and us!</p> <p>Please don't go through with this really bad idea.</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 water agencies throughout the state have developed portfolios to provide the necessary water for their region. The solution to the State's water problem is multi-faceted and will include multiple actions throughout the state. Ways to reduce demand are in process at this time. Various programs for storage, reuse and added reliability are being evaluated and implemented. Those actions do not provide the entire solution; therefore, the project is being proposed as one of the pieces of the overall program. However, neither the State nor Federal governments have the authority to dictate action by the various water entities. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1363	1	A fix that solves more problems, import water from states with flooding.	<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 refer to Master Response 4.</p>
1364	1	I'm tired of water projects that unfairly subsidize agriculture at the expense of ordinary Californians. This project is much larger than necessary, will damage the environment and will use public monies for private benefits (agriculture). The tunnel project should be turned down, not supported.	<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. In its efforts to achieve the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration, the California WaterFix seeks to protect dozens of species of fish and</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			wildlife in the Delta while also securing reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California. Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed California WaterFix.
1365	1	Almonds are good, but not worth reducing the state's low water supply for that purpose. Thank you for your consideration.	<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>
1366	1	I love almonds, but we must preserve an adequate quantity of water flowing through the Delta.	<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 Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
1367	1	The tunnels will cause great damage while wasting water on almonds and other nuts which are not essential.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<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>
1368	1	I can do without almonds and other nuts but not without water. Please preserve water for people first.	<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>
1369	1	I recently visited the Delta and farmers are deeply concerned that the tunnels will cause permanent irrevocable harm to the delta. Salt incursion will destroy the farmland forever. Please explore the alternatives.	<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>Effects of the alternatives on salinity levels are described in Chapter 8, Water Quality, and Appendix 8H, Electrical Conductivity, EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Modeling results indicate that the implementation of the water conveyance facilities may positively or adversely affect in-Delta water quality, depending on a number of factors including location, time of year, and hydrologic conditions. See tables in Appendices 8E through 8N for specific results related to various water quality constituents (including bromide and chloride).</p> <p>In addition to potential effects associated with the project and alternatives, modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the proposed project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 14, Water Quality, for more details regarding effects of the alternatives on salinity levels.</p>
1370	1	This project is a huge diversion from what California should really be doing about water -- learning how to do more with less, and the smart use of gray and recycled water. Industrial scale agriculture is not the wave of our future. If this project goes through, it will be more business as usual for big agriculture, to the detriment of our 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>

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 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>
1371	1	Enough of the destruction and diversion of water in California!	<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>
1372	1	I know we have an urgent crisis; the drought, but we should not devastate the delta ecology to ship water south...agri-business consumption must be addressed in a balanced manner.	<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>
1373	1	<p>Taking water from the river in this way seems like a really bad idea.</p> <p>Destroying the natural flow and reducing the amount that passes through will have a huge and potentially negative effect on everything downstream. Perhaps it's better to rethink what kind of crops we can grow in our changing climate reality.</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>DWR’s fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The Lead Agencies do not have land use planning authorities (such as changing local land uses and zoning ordinances or controlling what crops should be planted). Providing regulatory oversight to agribusinesses is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. 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>Please refer to Master Response 34 (Beneficial Uses) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
1374	1	<p>We are in a drought but California is mostly desert, what can we expect?</p> <p>Folks and corporations must get rid of lawns and put in xeriscape. This was very successful in Nevada.</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 Master Response 4 regarding the range of alternatives selected.</p> <p>The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>The commenter does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS.</p>
1375	1	<p>While I agree with the concept of an upriver water diversion point being more environmentally friendly than the current diversions in the south Delta, I would only support such a concept if the upstream diversion project provided sufficient guaranteed and enforceable freshwater flows through the Delta and into San Francisco Bay which would restore the Sacramento-San Joaquin Bay-Delta Estuary natural ecosystem to the maximum extent possible. Fish and wildlife habitat restoration must include freshwater flows in addition to improvements in habitat substrate and water quality. To mitigate for past damages to the ecosystem by water diversions, freshwater flows through the Delta must be increased above current levels. Implement the SWRCB's flow criteria for the Delta by creating enforceable flow standards and ecosystem health will improve.</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 lead agencies have proposed a flow scenario under Alternative 4A that avoids significant impacts on Delta aquatic resources. These flow requirements may be adjusted based on requirements embodied in the ESA Section 7 permits issued by the NMFS and UWSFS, Section 2081(b) permit issued by CDFW, and requirements part of the change in point of diversion issued by the SWRCB.</p>
1375	2	<p>Continue to reduce water demand by encouraging water conservation and recycling. To help reduce water demand, discontinue encouraging further human population growth and new housing developments in California.</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, Water Demand Management). These actions are being considered to meet future water demands for planned municipal uses consistent with water demand projections in the recent Urban Water Management Plans submitted to DWR which include approaches to meet the 20 percent reduction per capita urban water use by 2020.</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>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1376	1	Our delicate ecosystem needs to be protected. We have already caused harm to it by our overpopulation.	<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).</p>
1377	1	In this day and age, when we recognize the importance of ecosystems, this proposal should be a non-starter. Let's start working with nature and stop subverting Her.	<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>
1378	1	I am a wildlife rehabilitator working with the Humboldt Wildlife Care Center. We just released two Osprey at the Sacramento River yesterday after being 5 months in our care. Those birds will not survive without adequate river flows and a healthy abundance of fish. Please think about the whole picture. Our world would be nothing without birds and wildlife.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The preferred alternative (Alternative 4A) includes AMMs for reducing impacts and mitigation measures compensating for significant impacts on wetlands and habitats, but habitat restoration would take place under a separate program. Chapter 11 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses measures to protect aquatic ecosystem, and Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses measures to protect terrestrial ecosystems.</p>
1379	1	<p>This little story should hit close to home: The now desert landscape of China "Lake" (thanks to the human infestation's overuse of natural resources) still occasionally has a small puddle of water here and there in early spring. One, among the petroglyphs, provides a precious limited water source for indigenous rodents. However, being rodents, they poop in the same water that is their limited resource, befouling it.</p> <p>On a global scale, how different are we?</p> <p>The drought is not the problem. The infestation of humans over the past several decades is the problem. The land has a limited environmental carrying capacity. And we are an infestation. Actually, the rodents are smarter. When resources are limited, they limit their population to the carrying capacity of the land.</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
		Charles Darwin and Garrett Hardin had it right.	
1380	1	Taking more water from the Delta will harm the Delta in northern California. The San Joaquin Valley and Southern California should develop their own water sources.	<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>By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports). Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. 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 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 24 for details on the Delta as a place and the impacts of the proposed project on the Delta.</p>
1381	1	<p>If allowed, this travesty of a proposal will guarantee the demise of several fish species, e.g. salmon, sturgeon, and demonstrates yet again that man is willing to sacrifice all and sundry for the sake of the almighty dollar and the vote. This relentless assault on what remains of our natural world is inexcusable, unacceptable, and will end badly.</p> <p>We've done more than enough damage already to our ecology and our environment, please scrap this horrendous plan immediately!</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>
1382	1	This is the peripheral canal in new clothes. The electorate defeated that bad idea in 1982. It was a bad idea then, and it is a bad idea 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>A number of important improvements have been made to set the current proposal apart from the Peripheral Canal. For instance, tunnels are proposed to reduce surface impacts associated with canals. The capacity of the Proposed Project is more than 10,000 cfs smaller than the Peripheral Canal. The project as proposed allows for dual conveyance allowing through-Delta operations to continue in order to maintain in-Delta water quality. The Proposed Project would require operation of the proposed new in-Delta portions of the CVP and SWP pursuant to environmentally stringent rules under the Federal Endangered Species Act and California Endangered Species Act.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1383	1	Decimating the Delta to feed the insatiable appetite for water in agriculture (and southern California, as well) is totally unacceptable. We have failed to implement meaningful measures to ensure water-wise standards in water-hogging areas south of the Delta. I live in Marin County, which endured dire drought conditions in the mid-1970s. I practice water conservation in my home, keeping my personal usage far below the average for my area. I'm tired of seeing others use water in a prodigal manner while so many of us have struggled for decades to conserve. The Delta tunnel project is not a solution. It is enabling, pure and simple, allowing agriculture and other moneyed interests to do "business as usual" while failing to address the real problem beneath it all: California's water-dependent lifestyle is not sustainable. Stop the Delta tunnel 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>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
1384	1	Control the population, no more water to Southern California urban growth!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project aims to allow the federal and state water projects to deliver more reliable water supplies, in a way less harmful to fish. The plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Please also refer to Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>
1385	1	I oppose the Delta tunnels project. In this time of drought, many people run out of water (wells run dry). We don't need to support industrial-scale agriculture in another part of the state. We need our water locally - here in Northern California.	<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>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The Lead Agencies do not have land use planning authorities (such as changing local land uses and zoning ordinances or controlling what crops should be planted). Providing regulatory oversight to agribusinesses is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. 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>Please refer to Master Response 34 (Beneficial Uses) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
1386	1	Shipping water to the desert of southern California and robbing the population, ecosystem and agriculture of northern California to appease large agribusinesses and the oil industry is bad business. They both pollute the land, use fracking water to irrigate crops and waste water growing water thirsty crops like nuts and cotton. Do not allow this theft and giveaway.	<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>One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board.</p> <p>The proposed project Lead Agencies have no power to impose penalties on individual water users. DWR and Reclamation have contracts with various entities, some of which sell water to water retailers, who have individual policies and programs to motivate ratepayers to conserve water. Different districts have the right to take different approaches depending on their individual circumstances.</p>
1387	1	Let's follow Israel's lead and use our water more wisely for 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. 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>
1388	1	This is not a prudent way in which to treat our Earth. Read Pope Francis' Encyclical and apply these values to your decision making. There is a better way to do this and this is the 21st century. Protect our ecosystems for this is our call to action.	<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 see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.</p>
1389	1	The destruction of an extremely valuable resource would be a tragedy (not to mention disgrace) for California's coast, one nearly impossible to remedy. Whereas, the agricultural interests would be able to regroup elsewhere.	<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/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 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
1390	1	The natural ecosystem of the Bay Delta cannot be replaced. The balance of nature is critical to our ultimate survival on this planet.	<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>
1391	1	No more massive public funds to benefit large corporate farmers, especially with 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>
1392	1	Yet another "peripheral canal" proposal. Big agribusiness would destroy the Delta ecology for hundreds of years for a few quarters of 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>A number of important improvements have been made to set the current proposal apart from the Peripheral Canal. For instance, tunnels are proposed to reduce surface impacts associated with canals. The capacity of the Proposed Project is more than 10,000 cfs smaller than the Peripheral Canal. The project as proposed allows for dual conveyance allowing through-Delta operations to continue in order to maintain in-Delta water quality. The Proposed Project would require operation of the proposed new in-Delta portions of the CVP and SWP pursuant to environmentally stringent rules under the Federal Endangered Species Act and California Endangered Species Act.</p>
1393	1	Our water needs to stay here for our 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</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/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. Senior water rights holders are not affected by implementation of action alternatives. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation would be able to pump from the proposed 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 adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S.</p>
1394	1	Our almond and pistachio consumption is one thing. Our addiction to meat and dairy a much more worrisome topic. All should be addressed.	<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>More than two-thirds of the residents of the state and more than two million acres of highly productive farm land receive water exported from the Delta watershed. The proposed project aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. However, the project proponents have no authority to designate what water is used for.</p> <p>One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board.</p> <p>The proposed project Lead Agencies have no power to impose penalties on individual water users. DWR and Reclamation have contracts with various entities, some of which sell water to water retailers, who have individual policies and programs to motivate ratepayers to conserve water. Different districts have the right to take different approaches depending on their individual circumstances.</p>
1395	1	This isn't a "fix", it's a disaster! The taxpayers won't pay for what amounts to a water heist.	<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. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), and Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding).</p>
1396	1	It is critical that we learn to work with Mother Nature at this time – the good of the whole ecosystem is the good of our human future as well.	<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/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>
1397	1	Most almonds are exported from California. We need our own water for our own state and citizens. We do not want corporations taking our water to enrich themselves!	<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 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>
1398	1	We need less water-intensive farming in our state, not more.	<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 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
1399	1	Water catchment works better than throwing more money into corporations' pockets. It is an ancient method that was worked for centuries, ask Australia. They do not allow a building to go up without some water catchment devices and they are fine 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>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<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. Although conservation components and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including storm water drainage. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California’s water resources. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>