

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1700	1	Please take action against a major ecological catastrophe. Better safe now than “I told you so” later. It is time to change the way we do things and I would like to think you would be a leader of positive change now rather than later.	<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>
1701	1	All I can say is shame on all of you that think this is a good idea. Big Ag should not get our water. Even if it means they go out of business. I can’t believe Governor Brown even considers this a good idea. I live on the American River and it has gotten smelly, it’s growing weird plants, all related to the drought. Taking more water will really screw up the ecosystem, just so greedy Ag can grow water-intensive orchards. Let them grow something more sustainable for California. This Delta tunnels project is a bad idea.	<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 beneficial use of water and water-intensive crops, please see Master Response 34.</p>
1702	1	Diverting Delta water is an environmental insanity.	<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 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>
1703	1	The Delta tunnels are not needed and would be an environmental disaster.	<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 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>
1704	1	We need to work together to develop water protections that also protect the environment. Everyone must give something up to help including industrial-scale, water-intensive crop farmers.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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>
1705	1	<p>This is a completely bad plan and really must be stopped. Water is very precious and must not be wasted by sending to Southern California so more fracking wells can be dug!</p> <p>Water us supposed to be ingested by living things, not used to blast more toxic fuel from our land and then turned around and sold, with toxins included, to farmers to water our food. This is beyond stupid and ridiculous and should be considered criminal.</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 laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows. Fracking or "hydraulic fracturing" presumably could be an "industrial" use of water, and is a lawful use of water. Pursuant to Senate Bill 4 from 2013 (Stats. 2013, Ch.313), moreover, the state Department of Conservation, through its Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR), is currently working on fracking regulations. Please see Master Response 34 for additional information regarding use of water delivered by proposed water conveyance facilities.</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>
1706	1	<p>The ecosystem for generations to come is more important than the almond industry.</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>
1707	1	<p>I live in the heart of Pajaro Valley. The devastation would be huge. Stop Big Ag now. We must preserve our biodiversity and rethink agriculture.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</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>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1708	1	This is ecologically unsound in every aspect. Please let us all take better care of our state than that.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>
1709	1	I'm a native Californian, who loves her state, and cares for the Bay-Delta ecosystem. Please don't usurp these waters for agri-business!	<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>
1710	1	Do not tinker with the Delta. No one can be that irresponsible. Not even with payola.	<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>
1711	1	The days of massive engineering projects to move California water from where it naturally is to where powerful political interests want it should be long gone.	<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. 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 flows in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries in drier periods.</p> <p>The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. 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>
1711	2	<p>We need comprehensive state-wide scientific water management consistent with current ecological knowledge, that employs conservation, reuse, drip irrigation, recycling and groundwater management to live with the water we will get in climate-change-causing future drier weather and droughts.</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. 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 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives.</p>
1712	1	<p>I am a resident of the Delta and realize the importance of not allowing this step to be taken. This area is being ruined by the manipulation of water that has already taken place. Don't make it worse with this nonsense for the benefit of parts of California that can't even understand the importance of conserving, which would do everything needed to negate the need.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S.</p> <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>
1713	1	<p>This water grab proposal is another example of Southern California's money and power over our State legislature. Northern California has the water, Southern California has the votes. Long-term, the very best option is to always put environmental impact analysis right at the forefront.</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 concerns who would benefit from the project and the importance of environmental impact analysis.</p> <p>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the Clean Water Act and federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. 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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the CEQA and NEPA documents were raised.</p>
1714	1	The Delta and San Francisco Bay are ecosystems critical to environmental stasis in Northern California. Please, Governor, allow these regions to continue to flourish for all who live in the Bay area and not just a small group of profit-seeking agriculture businesses.	<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>
1715	1	We cannot put agriculture above the Delta! Almonds and other crops are too water-intensive to be grown in California. We must look ahead and help these farmers transition to less water-intensive crops, in order to keep the Delta healthy. Please stop more water diversions!	<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>
1716	1	Robbing the Delta of a substantial part of its fresh water inflow is insane at a time when saltwater intrusion is increasing due to the drought and sea level rise. Don't do 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>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>
1717	1	On top of the tunnels they are dumping massive amounts of herbicides such as Roundup (glyphosate) to kill invasive plants. The concentration of these carcinogens will go up and their damage will be spread even further if the tunnels are allowed to destroy 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>The project would use limited, selective application of herbicides to control invasive aquatic plants in</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>conformance with other programs in the Delta that manage invasive aquatic species. Project use of herbicides to control invasive plant species is discussed in detail in Conservation measure 13. Please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. For more information regarding herbicide use to control invasive plants please see the Division of Boating and Waterways' Aquatic Weed Control Program and Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments of the FEIR/EIS.</p>
1718	1	Please preserve our ecology and native species. Save our water.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>
1719	1	Isn't it time we stop putting profits for the rich before the rights of all people who share this earth together?	<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>
1720	1	Towns and cities are running out of water for their residents. Please keep our water here.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S.</p>
1721	1	Please do not undermine the work Earth Justice has been doing to restore and protect the Delta. Please oppose the Delta tunnels project. Industrial-scale agriculture is devastating to our ecosystems and we cannot sacrifice areas of ecological importance to sustain them.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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).
1722	1	I urge you not to undertake this project, to protect our precious environment and endangered species. Once done it takes a huge effort, if even possible, to ever reverse such a mistake!	<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 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>
1723	1	In this period of extreme drought the first priority should be water for humans. The Delta and San Francisco Bay must have a chance to grow without siphoning off all this water.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep Nodecline.</p>
1724	1	Stop sending our water down to the desert. Let them work out their own solution.	<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>
1725	1	We do not need almonds---They use more water than most crops---We do need water. Q.E.D.	<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 4 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via proposed conveyance facilities.</p>
1726	1	Wake up to the water shortage please.	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
			<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>
1727	1	This is really, really a bad idea! We need to be restoring ecosystems, not further eroding them! Thank you for considering a different strategy to deal with our water crisis!	<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>
1728	1	Why would we divert water from the state that has perhaps the major drought in the country. Please protect this water for 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>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1729	1	Please say No to the Delta tunnels project! It screams disaster for the Sacramento River's well established flow that doesn't need being ruined!	<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 project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p>
1730	1	California has a so-called semi-arid climate. But right now, it's more like just arid with a 4-year drought. No way is this "Delta tunnel water project" acceptable. Furthermore, we already have too many water-greedy crops almonds and pistachios. No, no, no!	<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>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1731	1	Conservation, changes in agricultural strategies, rainwater collection systems and other creative water saving measures like shading canals with solar panels, low flow toilets, and waterless urinals are the solution to California's water scarcity, not inordinately expensive and wasteful tunnels.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies needed to meet California's overall water management needs. It is not a substitute for increased commitments to other water supply solutions, including recycling, desalination, water conservation and storage. Please refer to Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives. Also, please see Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management.</p>
1732	1	Protect our water. Protect our ecosystem. Their habitat is our habitat.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1733	1	This is not a good idea. Once such a thing is built, it will be used at full capacity immediately, regardless of ecosystem damage.	<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 project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p>
1734	1	Please think carefully about the alterations in flora and fauna, some irretrievable, that this tunnels project would wreak. Many subsidence issues in [the] Central Valley have already occurred.	<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 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>
1735	1	It is imperative that we protect our water system that flows naturally. Making this project possible will seriously undermine the local Delta and general ecology. Please stop this greedy project that would greatly benefit some farmers and also put the environment at risk.	<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. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p>
1736	1	<p>Uses of our seemingly finite water must be carefully focused on what serves the greatest need in the most direct and efficient manner.</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>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.</p>
1737	1	<p>This is a proposal that makes no scientific and ecological sense. Our governor is often led astray by political solutions. Please, don't follow him. Say no to the Delta tunnels 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>Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>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).</p>
1738	1	<p>We should not be diverting water to subsidize big agriculture. We also should not be taking water that severely impacts the delta and bay ecosystems.</p> <p>We should, instead, be pursuing known methods of getting more out of the water we have.</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>For information about purpose and need of this project, please see Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1739	1	Ban fracking!	<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/EIS were raised.</p>
1740	1	Stop the Delta tunnels project. They will rob the Sacramento Delta of badly-needed 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>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). Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p>
1741	1	California voters have been fighting off this very same water rip-off for the past forty years.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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. 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.</p>
1742	1	This is anything but a save [for] the Delta. This a destroy the Delta and the Bay ecosystem [plan]. It simply ships more water south of the Delta. We need to face the reality that there is not enough natural water to do the present commitments let alone take more water out of the Delta/Bay ecosystem. No 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>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.
1743	1	The best water fix is stopping all new construction unless all of the proposed homes are constructed with every water-saving technology, with integrating "grey water" in first place, and hot water re-circulating pumps second in line, and of course all of the low-flush toilets, 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>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>
1743	2	We need water for food, but not at the expense of the Delta.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
1744	1	Ecology and environment needs to come 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>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1745	1	We have no guarantee at this point that any part of California will remain habitable in a changed climate. We don't need to channel more of our precious water to commercial 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 anticipated hydrologic changes due to climate change (increased temperatures and more years of critical dryness, increased water temperatures, changes in precipitation and runoff patterns, sea level rise, and tidal variations) will constrain and challenge future water management practices across the state, with or without the proposed project. The state is addressing climate change through strategies and a decision-making framework as outlined in the California Climate Adaptation Strategy and Adaptation Planning Guide. However, no single project and indeed none of the project alternatives would be able to completely counteract all of the impacts of climate change.</p> <p>More information on ways in which the California WaterFix proposes to improve resiliency and adaptability of the Delta to climate change can be found in Chapter 29, Climate Change, EIR/EIS and Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, EIR/EIS.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1746	1	<p>Please consider sustainable alternatives which promote long term resilience to the droughts and heating of climate change including recycling waste water, rain catching and storage, water conservating irrigation systems and adapting crop planting to the drought.</p> <p>Agriculture will adapt to changing conditions without the bailout of alternative 4. I would prefer that money be offered to research for a long term, sustainable solutions.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of a particular water supply augmentation approach (reclamation, rain capture, greater agricultural conservation) and does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the range of alternatives selected.</p> <p>The alternatives included in the Draft EIR/EIS represent a legally adequate reasonable range of alternatives and the scope of the analysis of alternatives fully complies with both CEQA and NEPA. The Lead Agencies carefully considered all potential alternatives that were proposed during the scoping process and during time of preparation of the Draft EIR/EIS. In response to public input, several new alternatives have been studied in the Recirculated DEIR/EIS and a new preferred Alternative (4A) identified.</p>
1747	1	<p>We really can't afford to make decisions that create more problems for citizens of California, which these diversion tunnels would cause.</p> <p>Please do not support the delta tunnels 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>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1748	1	<p>The Sacramento River Delta has been already too improperly managed by humans over history please do not add insult to injury with the tunnel diversion system.</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. 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.</p>
1749	1	<p>There is no economy without an ecology.</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>
1750	1	<p>Bad ideas do not need funding. Do not endanger salmon and other fish species.</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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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>
1751	1	<p>I feel personal affection for the Delta and do not want to see it changed or spoiled. There are more important factors in life than the interests of humans. When we have decimated all, we are next to be.</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>
1752	1	<p>How much longer can we ignore our environment in place of continual human development and over population. We have overlooked the word "balance" and it's meaning. For humans to exist in a healthy environment (which we all want) we must have and protect biodiversity.</p> <p>We must stop the continual destruction! Can I live without almonds for a while? Certainly, but of course it's about so much more than nuts.</p> <p>It's about learning when to say "no" and enough is enough! We are destroying our planet at such a rapid pace!</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>
1753	1	<p>We need to focus on developing water efficiency standards for big agriculture and other major users, not destroy one eco-system to help another.</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. 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>
1754	1	<p>We pay enough taxes, you're hurting California, you're making it so hard to live here, now I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Delta Tunnels plan.</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>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1755	1	This is being done without looking at the larger picture of how to systemically reduce water use.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California’s water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. 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>Although many of the proposed alternatives included meritorious water policy principles, the proposals rejected by the Lead Agencies did not qualify as appropriate alternatives for various reasons. For example, proposals were rejected because they were inconsistent with the project’s objectives and purpose and need or included components that are beyond the scope of the project. The text of the Draft EIR/EIS in Chapter 3 (section 3.2) and Appendix 3A to that document thoroughly explain the process used to develop the alternatives, and explain why certain potential alternatives were considered but ultimately rejected by the Lead Agencies. Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives).</p>
1756	1	Please do not take the fresh water away from people. We all live here in California, and everyone, without exception, will be impacted by water shortage. Thank you for your consideration for the environment and people of 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>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1757	1	I understand the desperate need for water, but I am horrified that the health of the Delta is considered being sacrificed. I oppose the Delta tunnels and am asking you to say no to the project. Please.	<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 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>
1758	1	As a Californian who wants to see the Bay-Delta protected, please nix the Delta tunnels project. Hasn't our environment and wildlife suffered enough with water diversions? Enough is enough.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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>
1759	1	Think about our future we won't be in drought forever, so protect our 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. 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>
1760	1	Please say no to the Peripheral Canal Two project! There are much better ways to provide water to Californians--cities and 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>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 36 (Peripheral Canal).</p>
1761	1	Building tunnels makes no sense. They divert water that is badly needed for the Delta to help a few large agricultural operations.	<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>
1761	2	The money should instead be spent building dams and taking other actions to increase the supply of available water for everyone.	<p>The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of a particular water supply augmentation approach (more storage) and does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>While water storage is a critically important tool for managing California's water resources, it is not a topic that must be addressed in the EIR/EIS for the proposed project. This is because the proposed project does not, and need not, propose storage as a project component. Although the physical facilities contemplated by the proposed project, once up and running, would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, the proposed project is a stand-alone project for purposes of</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			CEQA and NEPA, just as future storage projects would be. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, of the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage. Please see Master Response 37 regarding water storage.
1762	1	Consider the ecosystems you are affecting. We can always find another way!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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>
1763	1	Water is vitally important to wildlife survival. Draining the delta could drive some species to the brink of extinction.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S.</p>
1764	1	Please don't divert our water to agriculture that is being sent out of our country.	<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>
1765	1	We have enough almonds. Water we need more of. Resources are for all of us, not just big business.	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>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>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.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 34 (Beneficial Uses) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) for further information.</p>
1766	1	<p>I have lived in San Joaquin County for over twenty-five years and I regularly row up and down the Delta waterways. I am opposed to the current water fix plan because I personally know how fragile our current eco-system is in the Delta.</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such 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>
1766	2	<p>I recently attended a press conference by Congressman Jerry McNerney and learned that the proposed water fix for California will cost 16 billion dollars and will not create any new water for California. This is a waste of tax payer's dollars and will devastate the water quality and all of the eco-systems that depend on the Delta for survival. We are already fighting a losing battle against the invasive water hyacinth.</p> <p>California is better than this. We can come up with a plan that protects our waterways and environment for future generations and that uses sensible conservation and recycling technologies to resolve California water problems. The Delta is a unique waterway that belongs to the world not just California.</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>
1766	3	<p>Our tax dollars should be spent more effectively to resolve the State's water problems by the following:</p> <p>Funding water recycling and groundwater recharging projects statewide that would be billions of dollars less expensive for rate payers than constructing a new version of the Peripheral Canal or major new surface storage dams. Meanwhile, these projects move communities towards water sustainability.</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. Rather, the scope and purpose of the proposed project is much more limited. As explained in Chapter 2 Project Objectives and Purpose and Need of the Final EIR/EIS, the fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the State Water Project (SWP) system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and Central Valley Project (CVP) south-of-Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework with statutory and contractual obligations. Please see Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Additional water storage was eliminated from consideration in the Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS through the alternatives development and screening process (discussed in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives). As such, the proposed project does not propose storage as a project component. Although the proposed project would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, Alternative 4A is a stand-alone project which demonstrates independent utility just as future storage projects would demonstrate. Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives) and Master Response 37 (Storage) for additional information.</p> <p>Master Response 36 explains how the BDCP or 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>
1766	4	<p>Our tax dollars should be spent more effectively to resolve the State’s water problems by the following:</p> <p>Retiring thousands of acres of impaired and pollution generating farmlands in the southern San Joaquin Valley and using those lands for more sustainable and profitable uses, such as solar energy generation.</p>	<p>The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of a particular water supply augmentation approach (greater agricultural land retirement) and does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the proposed project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan’s strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>For more information regarding agricultural beneficial water use please see Master Response 34.</p>
1766	5	<p>Our tax dollars should be spent more effectively to resolve the State’s water problems by the following:</p> <p>Improving Delta levees in order to address potential earthquake, flooding, and future sea level rise concerns at a cost between \$2 to \$4 billion and is orders of-magnitude less expensive than major conveyance projects that are currently being contemplated.</p>	<p>Please see Chapter 2, FEIR/EIS, for the BDCP/CWF purpose and need, and Appendix 6A Sections 6A.2 and 6A.3 for discussion on existing levee improvement programs and funding mechanisms, which would not be affected by the BDCP/CWF. Levees are an important public safety resource and the proposed project would not change levee policy or replace ongoing programs and grant projects aimed at facilitating and supporting levee improvements in or outside the Delta. It recognized that levee maintenance and safety in the Delta is an important issue for the residents of the Delta and for statewide interests.</p>
1766	6	<p>Our tax dollars should be spent more effectively to resolve the State’s water problems by the following:</p> <p>Increasing freshwater flows through the Delta to reduce pollutants so ecosystems and wildlife can be restored.</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/EIS.</p>
1767	1	<p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Delta Tunnels plan.</p> <p>Delta fisherman and Delta lover!</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1768	1	<p>What we are seeing now with our Governor Brown is a continuation of kicking the can down the road. Before our Governor can even begin to think of these tunnels, he has to add extra water to the system. I mean by that, Sites Reservoir, the extension of the Shasta Dam and all of the other water storage ideas that were available to us as we voted for action by approving \$7.2 billion at the last election to build these storage reservoirs before we take more water away for our southern Californians. I realize that the original Peripheral Canal and the Tunnels are a good idea, as we need to keep the salt water from contaminating the fresh water at the Tracy Pumps for the Delta Mendota and California Aqueduct, but we first have to add water to the system or it just won't work. We already have made this Bay ecosystem a giant mess, but that was because of the stupidity of our government for the</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 37 regarding water storage.</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.</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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		last 150 years.	managing California's water resources. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.
1768	2	The Department of Water Resources should be eliminated and something new started up in its place. For instance, we have studied the Sites Reservoir since 1958 at a cumulative cost of \$2 billion, with environmental studies 4 feet high, \$400 an hour consultants and attorneys feeding at the trough, as we are now on our 5th set of studies upon studies, with many others stopping the entire process, and the DWR playing games the entire way and looking the other way as all of the dollar resources were used up. I went to the meetings and saw the incredible waste as the DWR stood there and never pulled the trigger on any project. If the current Governor knew what in the hell he was talking about, he would, by executive fiat, begin building the Sites Dam for starters and continue on after that with the needed improvements to the water infrastructure, just as his Dad did, and then build the tunnels if we have any money left from the train to nowhere where he has now begun to waste, what will be the biggest money boondoggle of all.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Please see Master Response 5 regarding cost.
1769	1	The proposal to build the tunnels will deflate my property values and all of Northern California. I'm depending on you to oppose and defeat this plan! It is economically unsound and a very bad financial deal for California.	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 Response3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (Delta as A Place).
1770	1	The San Joaquin River Delta, more precious than the blood flowing through our veins.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
1771	1	This project is not a good one. The Los Angeles area and the people living in the lower part of the San Joaquin Valley can build dams to hold water for themselves. In a normal water year the Mt. Baldy area and other mountains around Los Angeles could store some Los Angeles water. The Los Angeles area could build plants to remove salt from sea water. Please do not take any more water from the Delta and ship it to the south.	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 contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).
1771	2	[ATT 1: Delta belongs to future generations; letter to newspaper]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in the comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
1771	3	[ATT 2: Capture that El Nino water; newspaper letter to the editor]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in the comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
1771	4	[ATT 3: Long-term water needs; newspaper letter to the editor]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in the comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1771	5	[ATT 4: State's latest plan a scaled-down version of more of the same; newspaper editorial]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in the comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
1771	6	[ATT 5: Assembly GOP leader talks policy; newspaper article]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in the comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
1772	1	The twin tunnels are a disaster waiting to happen, with no support in Stockton and vicinity. Besides potentially being a budget-buster, it is environmentally dangerous to the Delta and wildlife, from all I have read and heard. I am not persuaded by the arguments for it and I urge you not to do it; consider other options which would [be] far less harmful.	<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> <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.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p>
1773	1	These tunnels are just more water theft by Southern California. No Tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
1774	1	<p>This letter is relative to the twin tunnels proposal.</p> <p>I am totally against this project because:</p> <p>This project does nothing to fix the state's existing water supply management and severe drought problems.</p> <p>From the environmental impacts to the projected financial costs (and there is a great deal of uncertainty) this project should be shelved.</p> <p>Time and resources would be better utilized by developing more dams and reservoirs. There isn't anything new about droughts. We know there will be more droughts and we thus need to be able to capture and store this valuable resource during the rainy times.</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 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>Future reservoir projects are still undergoing evaluation or review, including potential surface water reservoir projects and groundwater storage projects. Therefore, potential storage projects are only considered in the EIR/S as cumulative impact projects (please see Master Response 37). It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p> <p>The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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, Demand Management Measures).
1774	2	I implore you to stop the twin tunnels proposal.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1776	1	I have been against this from the very start and am disappointed how the Governor is ignoring the voice of his constituents. You will not build the twin tunnels and devastate the economy and the environment of my home!	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 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 24 (Delta As A Place).
1777	1	I have owned a home [in Stockton] for the last 40 years and I have been against this from the very start and am disappointed how the Governor is ignoring the voice of his constituents. You will not build the twin tunnels and devastate the economy and the environment of my home!	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 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 24 (Delta As A Place).
1778	1	Please do not pass Governor Brown's proposal on the twin tunnels. It will be a disaster. Let Los Angeles get their water somewhere else.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
1779	1	The twin tunnels are not in the public's interest, they do nothing to create new water. The main purpose is to steal the high quality, less polluted Sacramento River water from its natural course into the Delta and San Francisco Bay. The loss of this less polluted water damages or destroys Delta and Bay habitat for animals' fish and people. The main reason the big money investors want this water is it helps them avoid their polluted ag runoff from the San Joaquin and when they over pump, the salt from the Bay now enters their pumps. The long and the short is they want to take more high quality water from everyone else. If they want more water they should reclaim all their toxic run-off and use that.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS.
1779	2	State law requires that the peoples' water is put to the best and highest use possible. I do not believe that people think hydraulic fracking, export almonds and export alfalfa is the highest and best use. Federal law, The Endangered Species Act (ESA) will also be violated as the endangered Salmon, Steelhead, Delta, Smelt and other species are damaged and destroyed by this water grab.	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 CALSIM II model assumptions provide the same deliveries to senior water rights holders under the No Action Alternative and all action alternatives. As discussed in Chapter 5, Water Supply, of the EIR/S, climate change, sea level rise, and population growth in the northern Delta watershed are anticipated to effect senior water rights holders (as shown in the comparison between the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative model runs) with or without implementation of the action alternatives. The 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. State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>that water pumped from the Delta be put to stipulated beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows. Fracking or “hydraulic fracturing” presumably could be an “industrial” use of water. As of the present, hydraulic fracturing is a lawful use of water, as state law generally permits oil and gas operators to engage in “the injection of air, gas, water, or other fluids into the productive strata, the application of pressure heat or other means for the reduction of viscosity of the hydrocarbons, the supplying of additional motive force, or the creating of enlarged or new channels for the underground movement of hydrocarbons into production wells[.]” (Cal. Pub. Resources Code, § 3106[b].) Pursuant to Senate Bill 4 from 2013 (Stats. 2013, Ch.313), moreover, the state Department of Conservation, through its Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR), is currently working on fracking regulations. An interim set of regulations allowing continued “well stimulation treatments” (including hydraulic fracturing) will remain in effect through 2014, and a new set of proposed regulations should take effect on January 2015. Senate Bill 4 also requires DOGGR, by July 1, 2015, to certify an EIR “in order to provide the public with detailed information regarding any potential environmental impacts of well stimulation in the state.” This EIR “shall address the issue of activities... that may occur at oil wells in the state existing prior to, and after” January 1, 2014. Through the rule-making process and the statutorily-mandated EIR, the state will better understand how much water is actually used for fracking in California and how much is likely to be used in the foreseeable future. Voluntary reporting indicates that the use of water for fracking is comparatively small, particularly compared with the water usage that has been reported in other states in connection with natural gas recovery. The Department of Conservation estimates that statewide, about 270 acre-feet of water per year is used for hydraulic fracture stimulation activities. For comparison’s sake, roughly 5.2 million acre-feet of water a year have been diverted from the Delta, on average, over the last 20 years by the federal and state water projects for farms and cities.</p> <p>The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) could modify water permits to balance and protect beneficial uses of water. If the Legislature declared fracking to be unreasonable, it would potentially trigger the SWRCB to revise water right permits in such a way as to restrict Delta water from being used for fracking. Please see Master Response 34 for additional information regarding use of water delivered by project facilities.</p>
1780	1	I am writing to protest the building of the twin tunnels. The Delta would be affected greatly and the cost would be enormous.	<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> <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.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p>
1780	2	The water needs of the north should not be used up to feed the south of our state. Please do not build the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1781	1	The property values of 3,000 Delta water users with water rights would be compromised by the change in water quality, quantity and levels that the Tunnel project would cause, making farming even more problematic.	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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/EIS.</p>
1781	2	<p>The report acknowledge a projected increase in "frequency, magnitude and geographic extent" of Microcystis algal blooms in the Delta creating toxic 'cyanotoxins' affecting flora, fauna and the threat of liver cancer in humans.</p>	<p>The analysis contained in the RDEIR/SEIS (Section 4, Section 4.3.4., Water Quality, Impacts WQ-32 and WQ-33) found for the preferred alternative (4A) that there would be no significant impact nor an adverse effect, while acknowledging that there is uncertainty. Alternative 4A also includes preferential south Delta pumping in the summer to limit the potential for increased Microcystis blooms and other water quality considerations.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 14.</p>
1781	3	<p>The reduced water flows will destroy the habitat of endangered fish: Chinook salmon, steelhead trout, and sturgeon and the related fishing industry.</p>	<p>For information about effects of the preferred alternative, Alternative 4A, on salmonids and sturgeon, please see Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Resources, which indicates that effects would not be adverse.</p>
1781	4	<p>The tunnels do not create any new water. As projected, only 250,000 more acre-feet of water will be shipped south each year. Not much for a \$16 billion investment. Water conservation could top that.</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Water delivered to the SWP and CVP water contractors participating in proposed project would be within the existing contract amounts to serve agricultural lands that have been cultivated and existing and planned community populations. As described in Chapter 5, Water Supply, of the EIR/S, it is anticipated that climate change would result in more frequent and more severe rainfall events and less snowfall than under historic conditions. These rainfall events would result in periods of time when the capacity of the existing intakes would not be adequate. Therefore, the proposed project would provide the maximum capacity in the intakes and tunnels during those periods of time to convey water during extremely wet periods to areas south of the Delta for storage and use during drier times. 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 flows in the wet winter months when the river flows are high to improve conditions for aquatic resources. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries in drier periods. The north Delta and south Delta intakes would only be used to divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements.</p> <p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).
1781	5	Water conservation could be Governor Brown's real legacy in place of the Tunnels, benefiting all Californians as well as the almond exporters with less expensive statewide projects for stormwater capture, groundwater recharge and water recycling which will ensure future sustainability, and at the same time protect this important California estuary.	<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.</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>
1782	1	I feel that we should have a vote on a project this size. Governor Brown is parceling up the twin tunnels project so he can avoid a vote. I feel he has acted untrustworthy and have come to dislike him.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1783	1	<p>We have 4 generations of family over 100 years living on this beautiful farmground and you are going to give it to the birds and fish. People nowadays do not use their brains, take ground that feeds people away.</p> <p>Please use common sense.</p>	Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need). Impacts to agriculture are identified and discussed in Chapter 14; lead agencies have proposed measures that would support and protect agricultural production in the Delta by securing agricultural easements and/or by seeking opportunities to protect and enhance agriculture with a focus on maintaining economic activity on agricultural lands. Please see Master Response 18 for more information on agricultural mitigation and Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).
1784	1	<p>I am a native Stocktonian of ninety-two years and feel that we don't need the twin tunnels that Governor Brown desires.</p> <p>We send water south by the Delta Mendota canal and they should be happy with that.</p> <p>Our Delta farmers are thrifty with their water and know how to manage it.</p>	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1785	1	<p>I am writing this letter in strong opposition to the current Delta Tunnels proposal. My objection is as follows:</p> <p>This proposal does not seem to consider water as a "common pool" resource. The fact that some areas and interests of the state have not been included in the decision-making, Delta residents in particular, is problematic.</p>	<p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S. These criteria include protection of senior water rights in the Delta, including the water rights associated with the common pool concept.</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>
1785	2	<p>I am writing this letter in strong opposition to the current Delta Tunnels proposal. My objection is as follows:</p> <p>This proposal does not adequately address the environmental, public health, or economic</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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>impact on the citizens of the state. It certainly won't produce more water, more reliable supplies or improved conditions for the environment of the Delta.</p> <p>This proposal does nothing to address the state's water supply as other options might. The fiscal study for this project seems to be nonexistent and should have been provided some time ago.</p>	<p>flexibility. For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.</p> <p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>The range of alternatives in the EIR/EIS includes alternatives which result in reductions in SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta as compared to the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative and Alternatives 4H1, 4H2, 4H3, 4H4; 5; 6A, 6B, 6C; 7; 8; and 9 would result in less SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta than under Existing Conditions (shown in Tables 5-5 and 5-8). Similarly, Alternatives 6A, 6B, 6C; 7; 8; and 9 would result in less SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta than under the No Action Alternative (shown in Tables 5-6 and 5-9). However, SWP and CVP water deliveries would continue under all alternatives.</p> <p>For more information on impacts to terrestrial and aquatic species see Chapter 12 and 11, for more information on public health see Chapter 25 and for more information on socioeconomic see Chapter 16.</p>
1785	3	<p>I am writing this letter in strong opposition to the current Delta Tunnels proposal. My objection is as follows:</p> <p>As a resident of the Delta area I fought the peripheral canal proposition in the '80s due to my financial concerns and the negative impact on the Delta region. Perhaps this is a generational issue but it seems that many of the argument we used to defeat that initiative apply to this project. By the way, what happened to the storage facilities that were to be built as part of the Central Valley Project in the middle of the last century? Once again we would be pitting factions and interests against each other rather than striving to create a plan where strong agreements exist. There are alternatives to the proposal that can save California tax and rate payers while invest in the jobs and local water sources that build sustainability. Together we can develop plans to address California's perpetual water shortages.</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>
1786	1	<p>Of all of the asinine stupidity, the tunnels are the worst. We do not have the water for this project. Diverting what little we have is simply more destruction to the environment and the loss of the natural biosphere.</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>
1786	2	<p>A waste of taxpayer money that could be better spent elsewhere. What about all the homeless everywhere? What about all the trash in the forests that needs to be cleaned out</p>	<p>DWR acknowledges your opposition to the project. Spending the money for this project elsewhere would not meet the purpose and need of the project to improve water supply reliability for the State and Federal</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		to prevent more disastrous fires? The roads that need repair? On and on. What you plan is contemptable.	water projects.
1787	1	Governor Brown's water plan to commit to unknown billions of dollars in today's economic climate is unrealistic. Enclosed is a much better plan. It is called the "Fat Levee Plan" authored by the Business Forecasting Center at the University of the Pacific. The cost of implementing this plan would be only a fraction of the Governor's plan. The science is reportedly sound where the governor's plan is not proven. The earthquake danger has apparently been overstated. Pages 1 and 5-8 of this print-out were blank pages and not included.	<p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the range of alternatives selected.</p> <p>The alternatives included in the Draft EIR/EIS represent a legally adequate reasonable range of alternatives and the scope of the analysis of alternatives fully complies with both CEQA and NEPA. The Lead Agencies carefully considered all potential alternatives that were proposed during the scoping process and during time of preparation of the Draft EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The specific proposals that were considered but ultimately rejected by the Lead Agencies are discussed in Appendix 3A of the DEIR/EIS, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1. Appendix 3A thoroughly explains why various proposals were not analyzed in the EIR/EIS, including the NRDC Portfolio-Based Proposal, Congressman Garamendi's Water Plan, and other similar concepts that would require actions that are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Please also refer to Master Response 3 for information on the purpose and need for the project. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p>
1787	2	<p>Farm production in San Joaquin County alone is in the billions of dollars per year. Its soils are unrivaled. It would be unconscionable to allow them to be deprived of fresh water and damaged by saltwater incursion. Additionally, there is a large agricultural supporting infrastructure as well as all of the other industrial, business, recreational and commercial activities including the growing Port of Stockton facilities. Allowing all of the Sacramento River water to flow into the Delta does not mean that sizeable volumes cannot be pumped south. It just means that politically powerful southern interests do not take priority over Delta needs. Preserving fish populations is a consideration, but does not override all else including the singular beauty of one of nature's wonders, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta in California.</p> <p>Also enclosed is an article which appeared in the Letters to the Editor in the August 6, 2012 of The Stockton Record by Dan Bowman Odenweller, an experienced water management official, which deserves close attention.</p>	<p>The proposed project is intended to provide a more reliable water supply, with diversions that are more protective for fish, in accordance with the Delta Reform Act co-equal goals of improving water supply reliability and Delta ecosystem health. The proposed water conveyance facilities provide for new water supply intakes on the Sacramento River that would be operated in conjunction with the existing SWP and CVP south Delta export operations to improve conditions for Delta fish and aquatic resources and provide for a more predictable and reliable export water supply. While a petition for a change in point of diversion is being filed with the State Water Resources Control Board for use of these new intakes, no application for any new water right is being sought as a part of the proposed project. DWR and Reclamation will petition the State Water Board to modify the points of diversion for the existing water rights permits that are the basis for SWP and CVP Delta operations. Prior to approving these petitions, the State Water Board must find that the requested changes will not cause injury to any legal user of water or result in harm to fish or wildlife. Please see Master Response 26 regarding Delta exports, area of origin protections and existing water rights.</p>
1787	3	[ATT1: Article titled "Levess that Lie Down: A Solution for Earthquakes in the Delta?" by Patricia McBroom]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in the comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
1787	4	[ATT2: Letter to the Editor by Dan Bowen Odenweller]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in the comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
1788	1	Jerry Brown is running California. Every time I go to the Veterans Affairs hospital in Livermore, I see the two cement rivers taking water to the south. 24/7, 365 days a year. Now in these times of drought, Jerry Brown is trying to build the twin tunnels to take more water south. From the article in the recent news, he fired the two officials in control of the underground water at the request of the major oil industries, who wanted to continue fracking so they could continue contaminating our underground water storage. He denies	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		taking money but two days after they were fired, \$750,000 was deposited in his campaign fund. Hopefully he is going to be the last of the Browns to ruin California.	
1788	2	Please do not allow Jerry Brown to waste California's money and change the natural system so salt water can rush back into our Delta and kill our ecosystem. Spend the billions to build desalination plants and there will be enough water for everyone. The ecosystem won't be harmed, he can use the money to build the commuter train and we can take millions off our highways.	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 contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.
1789	1	The voters of California realized that the Peripheral Canal was a bad idea and voted it down. We are not being allowed a vote on the Twin Tunnels project. These tunnels during construction and later operation will be even more damaging to the land and water than the canal. The total destruction of prime farm areas now "protected" by the Clean Water Act will most certainly take place.	The commenter does not offer any evidence on how the project would result in significant impacts to land, water, or prime farmland related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 36 for information regarding how the proposed project differs from the peripheral canal.
1789	2	Not to be ignored is the salt water intrusion, already a problem on the Delta farm lands. How will this lame-brain project (once completed and unable to be undone) affect the deep water ports of Stockton and Sacramento? The profitable bay shrimp industry in San Pedro Bay was destroyed when we began diverting vast amounts of water to Southern California.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS. The potential for water conveyance operations to affect salinity conditions in the Delta (including Suisun Marsh) under existing conditions and future no action conditions, and with implementation of each project alternative (including conservation measures), is assessed in detail in Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the EIR/EIS for the salinity-related parameters chloride (Impact WQ-7) and electrical conductivity (Impact WQ-11). Where significant impacts to water quality would occur due to the alternative, mitigation to lessen those impacts is provided.
1789	3	I remember when the Calaveras River was, indeed, a wide flowing river. The waterways around Stockton were clean enough to swim in. Remember Yosemite Lake at the end of Smith Canal? There was even a raft to swim to. The San Joaquin was also a wide flowing river with lots of beautiful water. Of course, dams built for flood control were necessary, but must we destroy and redo nature unnecessarily in the name of advancement? Los Angeles has made a desert of places like Owens Valley. The city also took water away from Mono Lake, thus the tufas. I have friends in Southern California who say that L.A. and the cities down there do little to save their rain water. An article April 18, 2015 in the Wall Street Journal discussed this very lack of water conservation: "A Rain Revolution for Dry, Thirsty, L.A." by Cynthia Barrett. L.A. often gets rain from systems coming up from Mexico and the Pacific when Northern California gets nothing.	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 contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).
1789	4	Wouldn't the billions of dollars needed to construct and operate the twin tunnels be better spent to help Southern California fix its own water problems? How about desalination	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		plants?	Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 7 regarding desalination.
1789	5	How about the fish? The decrease in water this year is going to affect the salmon population for years to come, and we plan to divert more water from the area?	Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Species, of the FEIR/FEIS describes the projected effects of the new preferred alternative, Alternative 4A to fish species. The analysis finds that there would be no adverse effects to salmonids.
1790	1	You will not build the Delta tunnels, doing so will impact the economy of Northern California and impact the value of our community.	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 to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place), and Master Response 5 (Cost).
1794	1	I am writing to let it be known that I totally oppose the Delta Tunnels/California Water Fix (alternative 4)A. The so called fix, is neither in the public's interest, nor the public pocketbook. A few will benefit at the expense of many. It has been pushed through without public vote, as the people have voted this idea down already twice. It will be more likely to cause earthquakes than prevent them. It will not create new water, nor will it protect the environment, thereby failing to fulfill the coequal goals which it portrayed as fulfilling.	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. An earthquake is what happens when two blocks of the earth suddenly slip past one another. The surface where they slip is called the fault or fault plane. Based on the proposed tunnel alignments, depths, tunneling method, and the energy involved in boring, the construction of BDCP tunnels is not expected to increase the chance of an earthquake.
1795	1	I am not at all in agreement with tunnels to transfer water to Southern California.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. 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.
1796	1	I have attended two presentations explaining the tunnels. I still believe a project that is so costly but does not create a drop of water through conservation, storage, or desalination is a waste of taxpayer dollars, especially when it risks further damage to an already weakened Delta ecosystem. California can do much better. I can only suspect it's more about money and power of the few.	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. 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.
1797	1	Our comments against the Twin Tunnels include: An outrageous idea to begin with, along with the Bullet Train.....Billions of dollars in tax money being spent foolishly.	Regarding the cost of the project, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those facilities. For more information regarding funding of the proposed project please see Master Response 5. 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Take this tax money and put it to some good use by building more dams, for one thing. Also, the entire Delta needs to be re-stored by fixing levees and by re-building some berms that have disappeared. The water weeds are also a very big problem that needs to be re-solved.</p> <p>This project will destroy the Delta region completely.</p> <p>A "no" vote on the Twin Tunnels and also the so called Bullet Train....Both of which are way out of line, costly, and which we do not need.</p>	<p>operational flexibility.</p> <p>Additionally, Please refer to Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.</p>
1798	1	<p>The Bay and Delta are already being deprived of the volume of water they need to survive and stay healthy. The cost of this project is not acceptable. California needs to recycle and conserve water, not steal it from the natural environment.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the Clean Water Act and federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental.</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. Refer to Master Response 6 (Demand Management). The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1799	1	<p>No more tunnels keep Nor-Cal water here where we need it to save the Salmon.</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 45 (Purpose and Need).</p>
1799	2	<p>Central California farmers need to put in drip irrigation and get with the program of conservation and organic fertilizing so the water that leaves their farms is not toxic.</p>	<p>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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			California WaterFix.