

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1800	1	This environmental destruction must stop. California should be investing in desalination plants and ending wasteful use of water.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.</p>
1800	2	Growing feed crops for livestock consumes 56% of water in the US. We cannot afford this any longer. http://www.cowspiracy.com/facts/	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.
1801	1	Restoration of rivers, wetlands, watersheds and ecosystems are what we need -- not a cement underground freeway for water export. Absolutely clueless!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The California WaterFix (referred to in the FEIR/FEIS as Alternative 4A) is DWR's preferred alternative under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Reclamation's preferred alternative under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Alternative 4A addresses the reverse flow problem by focusing on the construction and operation of new north Delta intakes and on habitat restoration commensurate with the footprint of these new facilities. The construction and operation of new conveyance facilities would help resolve many of the concerns with the current south Delta conveyance system while otherwise helping to reduce threats to endangered and threatened species in the Delta through habitat restoration, as necessary to mitigate significant environmental effects and satisfy applicable ESA and CESA standards. Implementing a dual conveyance system, in which water could be diverted from either the north or the south or both, depending on the needs of aquatic organisms, would align water operations to better reflect natural seasonal flow patterns by creating new water diversions in the north Delta equipped with state-of-the-art fish screens. The new system would reduce the ongoing physical impacts associated with sole reliance on the southern diversion facilities and allow for greater operational flexibility to better protect fish. Minimizing south Delta pumping would provide more natural east-west flow patterns. The new diversions would also help protect critical water supplies against the threats of sea level rise and earthquakes. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <p>Although Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A include only those habitat restoration measures needed to provide mitigation for specific regulatory compliance purposes, habitat restoration is still recognized as a critical component of the state's long-term plans for the Delta. Such larger endeavors, however, will likely be implemented over time under actions separate and apart from these alternatives. The primary parallel habitat restoration program is called California EcoRestore (EcoRestore), which will be overseen by the California Resources Agency and implemented under the California Water Action Plan. Under EcoRestore, the state will pursue restoration of more than 30,000 acres of fish and wildlife habitat by 2020. These habitat restoration actions will be implemented faster and more reliably by separating them from the water conveyance facility implementation.</p>
1802	1	Please deny Alternative A Delta tunnels/"California WaterFix." It is in no way a "fix." In fact, such a plan would be ruinous for the ecosystems of both the Delta and the Bay. These ecosystems would suffer irreparable damages, with far-reaching consequences from both nearby citizenry and for wildlife throughout the proposed affected areas, and far beyond. There are other alternatives available which are not destructive on a draconian level as is	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>the Delta tunnels proposal. By channeling funding towards local water sources and towards jobs, sustainability can become a reality. Also, very notably, beleaguered California taxpayers/ratepayers will benefit from the savings of billions of dollars.</p> <p>I urge you to consider these factors and to deny Alternative A, the Delta tunnels/ "California WaterFix," the ruinously-planned plan.</p>	<p>The commenter does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS. 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. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the range of alternatives selected.</p>
1803	1	Please protect California's Bay-Delta; stop ruining and exploiting the environment.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p>
1804	1	Too late -- should have been dealing with water shortage way before this.	<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>
1805	1	Please represent "we the people," not "we the corporate interests."	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1806	1	We must protect the entire Bay-Delta ecosystem! The Delta tunnels will cause irreparable harm to a critical ecosystem! Please oppose this poorly-conceived tunnel plan -- the Bay-Delta ecosystem cannot be the water supply for California crops! This tunnel plan is no "water fix"! A "fix" that destroys the source it comes from is no "fix" at all -- please stop this destruction from even starting!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Please note that the project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole. Please see Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need of the proposed project.</p> <p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>Since the late 1800s, the Bay-Delta ecosystem has been substantially altered. Changes in key environmental attributes of the Bay-Delta have contributed to the current degraded state of the ecosystem and appear to be proximate causes of declines in desired fishes and increases in non-native species. California WaterFix is not intended to address all the factors that have contributed to the Delta's decline and briefly summarizes a few but not all of those factors. Many factors that have contributed to the decline of the Delta's ecosystem</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>including the conversion of tidal marsh and floodplains to farmland, construction of levees and altering of tide flows, in-Delta and upstream water diversions, contaminant discharges, ammonia and nutrient discharges and changes to the food web, increases in water temperatures, and introduction of non-native and invasive species. The Delta will remain in a highly altered state for the foreseeable future and the project is not intended to address all the past harms or restore the Delta to a pre-altered state.</p> <p>Providing regulatory oversight to agribusinesses is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. The plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Although the project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented California WaterFix project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Please see Master Response 26 for additional information on effects on northern California.</p> <p>It is important to note, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 (Demand Management) for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p>
1807	1	We cannot continue to alter our natural world to benefit with money. There are other choices to be made on a large agricultural scale for these food products. This is not the way to go.	<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>
1808	1	Almond and pistachio trees should be grown only where there is sufficient 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>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>
1809	1	This project will endanger all the wildlife -- fish, birds, and animals -- in the Delta region, along with the various crops that are grown 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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		These tunnels must not be built. This will be massive destruction to this special estuary many of us call home.	<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. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
1810	1	The California Delta has been my home for years. I am against the tunnels project because it would have a negative impact on the Delta ecosystem and on the farming that takes place in the Delta.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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. Chapters 11 and 12 Final EIR/EIS describe the project's expected negative and positive effects on the Delta ecosystem, based on the best available data. In addition, both chapters present measures that would avoid, minimize, and compensate for significant impacts.</p>
1811	1	Stop exporting our water overseas in the guise of almonds and alfalfa. It's California water and should stay in California during these unprecedented times.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via California WaterFix proposed conveyance facilities.</p>
1812	1	This Bay has been my home my entire life, as well as home to many ecologically important species. By going through with this project, you not only threaten the welfare of the Bay's human population, but also, the natural environment and the creatures that inhabit it. We are tired of being victims of the waste and inefficiencies of the agriculture industry. This is not the solution to drought.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The Lead Agencies discuss community character in Chapter 16 of the EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A (Socioeconomics) identifies the unique features of the Delta and describes the potential effects on Delta communities. Please see chapter 15 for a discussion on impacts to recreation. Impacts to agriculture are identified and discussed in Chapter 14; project proponents have proposed measures that would support and protect agricultural production in the Delta by securing agricultural easements and/or by seeking opportunities to protect and enhance agriculture with a focus on maintaining economic activity on</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			agricultural lands. Please see Master Response 18 for more information on agricultural mitigation.
1813	1	<p>The Delta tunnels would take California 180 degrees from a sustainable solution. Our time, money and energy need to be directed to a complete overhaul of water-wasting agriculture. Here in Sonoma County the biggest culprit is big wine. Like almonds, pistachios and cattle, this product is not largely consumed here.</p> <p>The end result of the Delta tunnels will only be to destroy our environment in order to increase profitable exports in the short-term. It will serve neither the long-term needs of the environment nor the people of California.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via proposed conveyance facilities.</p>
1814	1	<p>Diversion of water from areas that historically depend upon it is immoral. Industrial-scale agriculture should not be draining limited resources.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via proposed conveyance facilities.</p>
1815	1	<p>Jerry, I voted for you and your dad. I rooted for you as Mayor of Oakland. Please don't disappoint me by stealing needed water from Northern California.</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>
1816	1	<p>It is bad policy to reward overly water-intensive usage (wrong incentive) and waste public funds in doing so (poor use of funds) and upset the natural Delta system in the bargain!</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Funding).</p>
1817	1	<p>No, no, no to this. "No" to Nestle continuing to siphon off California's water and re-sell it. No.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1818	1	Leave the water alone! People are going without! No more give away with our water!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1819	1	There must be better place to grow almonds. At least better places from which to get the water. The "grow everything in California" attitude must stop. But we just keep approving more housing developments and more consumption [until] no one can live here. This is crazy. Everybody wants to grow the economy by any means. That translates to consumption of resource until we have used or polluted or destroyed every resource that makes life possible.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
1820	1	The Sacramento River and Delta are precious natural resources in California. Once radically changed, they cannot be recreated and subsequent loss of habitat and species will be forever. Please do not divert water for agriculture in the Delta tunnels project. It will destroy this unique and precious 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. 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>
1821	1	We need sustainable water use, including sustaining of waterways like 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>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 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>
1822	1	I have family that lives in the Delta region and they along with my own research over the years cannot support this project. We are committed to trying to restore this area rather than its destruction.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p>
1823	1	<p>Ruining an area is not a "solution" to the water crisis. Limit growth of human migration where it is unsustainable.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
1824	1	<p>Absolutely, action needs to be taken. I sincerely do not feel this is the plan that would protect our Delta and provide water to our increasing population. Agriculture is California but they need to instigate changes and learn from other countries (New Zealand for example) on how they have dealt with long-term drought.</p> <p>Agriculture must partner with the state to make changes that benefit everyone. Thank for your consideration of this vital issue that affects all of us worldwide, not just California.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. In its efforts to achieve the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration, the California WaterFix seeks to protect dozens of species of fish and wildlife in the Delta while also securing reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California. Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed California WaterFix.</p>
1825	1	<p>Please don't destroy the region's ecology and endangered species by creating the 35-mile-long underground water export tunnels through the Bay-Delta. We are all connected and when you destroy ecology and species it has a ripple effect which ultimately affects us all. Water-intensive almond and pistachio agriculture needs to be scaled back during this drought. Please do the right thing, I implore you.</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 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>
1826	1	<p>Please focus on sustainable water solutions for California. We should not be diverting massive amounts of water for agriculture that cannot be sufficiently maintained by its local environment. Water is too valuable of a resource to squander on a few cash crops at the expense of everything else. We cannot afford to waste water to prop up an industry that clearly has no place continuing in a state with drought issues. Please vote no on the Delta</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		tunnels project.	The proposed project does not prioritize subsidized water. The proposed project does not make determinations regarding how water conveyed through the proposed project, California Aqueduct, Delta Mendota Canal, or other water conveyance facilities is put to a beneficial use. Contractors and their customers must make economic decisions about planting in light of the amounts of water they are likely to receive going forward.
1827	1	We need to stop stealing water from the Sacramento River Delta. This continued water grab by farmers and population centers in Southern California is a consequence of growing crops and placing population in locations where adequate local water supplies can not keep up with demand. We need to put an end to this continued 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.</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. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
1828	1	I empathize tremendously with the plight of our farmland in California and the water shortage, especially in how it affects our farmers and their livelihood, but I would prefer a project that would have less of a negative environmental impact.	<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>
1829	1	We must stop stealing from Peter to pay Paul. Let all of us be more creative and less greedy.	<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>
1830	1	As a Northern California native and resident for over 60 years, I unequivocally oppose the Delta Tunnels project. I say no to this Delta Tunnels Project. The California Water Fix project is just the opposite. This effort will not fix the California water shortage in the southern part of California. These proposed tunnels will divert extraordinary amount of water from the Sacramento River – the primary fresh waterway for the San Joaquin Delta and San Francisco Bay. Most of this water is planned to be diverted for large scale agri-business, especially those large almond and pistachio orchards that require extensive water to survive. Again I say no to this Delta Tunnels project – keep California’s water safe for everyone, not just a few large multi[-national] corporations who have extremely large pockets from which to	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		lobby and put pressure on politicians. No to the California Water Fix plan that will divert fresh water away from the Sacramento River, the San Joaquin Delta, and the San Francisco Bay. No to the Tunnels Project.	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.
1831	1	Please protect our precious natural resources. Don't wreck them for industrial profits. More almonds, pistachios, etc. are unnecessary luxuries in this difficult time.	<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>
1832	1	I have never been in favor of this and now, during our drought, is the worst time to try this. 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>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1833	1	Be responsible for the health of the planet and institute intelligent water management. Industry must not continue to take more than nature can sustainably give.	<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>
1834	1	I am completely opposed to this tunnel/pump plan. We need to learn to manage the resources we have locally and responsibly towards the environment and all life that shares this beautiful state.	<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>
1835	1	I have always been one of your supporters, and I am shocked would would consider such destruction to the Delta -- one of the most important ecosystems in the entire West.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. 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>
1836	1	Haven't we learned to work and learn from nature instead of altering and destroying 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>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. The premise of the California WaterFix is that it will provide environmental benefits while stabilizing water supplies for a large population of California residents, consistent with statutory policy as found in the Delta Reform Act of 2009 (see, e.g., California Public Resources Code, §§ 85001(c), 85002, 85004(a), 85020.) Refer to Master Response 31 (Compliance with the Delta Reform Act).</p>
1837	1	Diverting water to big agriculture in Southern California in order to grow almonds and pistachios, among other things, for export and which I cannot afford to buy is a bad idea. We need the water here for our San Francisco Bay 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>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>
1838	1	Please do not move forward with the Delta tunnels project – the health of the Bay/Delta ecosystem is crucial and diverting additional water from these sensitive water is short-sighted and risky strategy for drought relief. I support EarthJustice and other environmental organizations that urge balanced and sustainable approaches to the water shortage.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>The project would help to address the resilience and adaptability of the Delta to climate change through water delivery facilities combined with a range of operational flexibility. In addition to the added water management flexibility created by new water diversions and operational scenarios, the project would</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>improve habitat, increase food supplies and reduce the effects of other stressors on the Delta ecosystem.</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.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives), Master Response 31 (Delta Reform Act) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
1839	1	Let's look at all the consequences of this action and also ban fracking for its use of our precious water. Thank you.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to stipulated beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows. Fracking – or “hydraulic fracturing” -- presumably could be an “industrial” use of water. As of the present, hydraulic fracturing is a lawful use of water, as state law generally permits oil and gas operators to engage in “the injection of air, gas, water, or other fluids into the productive strata, the application of pressure heat or other means for the reduction of viscosity of the hydrocarbons, the supplying of additional motive force, or the creating of enlarged or new channels for the underground movement of hydrocarbons into production wells[.]” (Cal. Pub. Resources Code, § 3106[b].)</p> <p>The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) could modify water permits to balance and protect beneficial uses of water. If the Legislature declared fracking to be unreasonable, it would potentially trigger the SWRCB to revise water right permits in such a way as to restrict Delta water from being used for fracking.</p>
1840	1	Southern California’s water goes out to the ocean instead of storing it with dams. Northern California doesn’t have enough water for themselves, let alone send in tunnels. Agri-business is important, but we have to retain our important rain fall, when we have it.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. No response is required.</p>
1841	1	It might be a Fix for the recipients of the water, but why devastate one part of the state to fix another? How about finding local solutions? Maybe agri-business has no place in a semi-desert?	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			operational flexibility. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
1842	1	We as good stewards of the Earth have an enormous responsibility to ensure the natural habitats and all of the creatures that reside within them are protected first and foremost. Choosing to support crops that are not suited for or supported naturally by the environment is short-sighted and inhumane. Profits can not be allowed to dictate the lives of creatures that are totally subject to the actions we take. Do the right thing and support the Delta, the Bay, and all of its inhabitants.	<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>
1843	1	All my life, I have been a fisherman, nature lover and boater. Given this, I am strongly opposed to the Water Fix Project or Delta Tunnels. Installing the Delta Tunnels is simply moving water around. It does not address the need for more water because simply carrying water in a tunnel or canal does not produce more water than we already have. Instead, it only moves it and destroys the environment.	<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 (Demand Management) for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</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. The project would also help to address the resilience and adaptability of the Delta to climate change. (Please see Master Response 31 [Delta Reform Act]).</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 Responses 26 (Effects on Northern CA), Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), and Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place), as well as Section 5 (Cumulative Impacts) of the RDEIR/SDEIS for additional information.</p>
1843	2	The restoration plan for flooding existing farms for the fish such as salmon and Delta smelt will not be very effective for their natural habitat. Salmon need to naturally migrate from fresh water to salt water to lay their eggs and live. If salmon are simply placed in a flooded farm, they are not able to naturally migrate from the California Delta to the ocean. As a	As the commenter notes, the preferred alternative (4A, or the California WaterFix proposed action) does not include large-scale habitat restoration. Large-scale restoration is being pursued under the California EcoRestore program, which is not associated with any habitat restoration to be done under California WaterFix. Tidal habitat restoration, as analyzed in the EIR/EIS, would have the potential to increase

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		result, the salmon population will drop. I understand that the habitat restoration plan has been removed from your plan to reduce cost which is much worse for the environment. Not only are the salmon unable to migrate, but they cannot live without the water.	productivity and available habitat for species such as Chinook salmon, with design characteristics that would avoid the stranding that the commenter implies.
1843	3	Putting the Delta tunnels in place will cause many job losses. These jobs include commercial fisherman, Delta farmers and boat mechanics. If salmon are not in the ocean, there will be no fish for the commercial fisherman. In regards to boat mechanics, my cousin is a boat mechanic in Discovery Bay and he works out of his home on the water. If there was no water for the boats to travel in, fewer boats could get to get to my cousin's house. If my cousin doesn't get boats to work on, then he would lose money. Lastly, the Delta farmers who work in the Delta would lose money because they would have no water to grow their crops. Their irrigation doesn't harm the Delta because the water they use on their fields soaks into the ground and eventually goes back into the Delta.	<p>Operations of the new preferred alternative, 4A, are not expected to result in a substantial decrease or increase in Delta surface water levels. Please refer to Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Modeling Results, EIR/EIS, for more information. Therefore, water levels will remain similar to existing conditions.</p> <p>Please refer to Impact ECON-13, 4, 5 and 6 under Alternative 4A, the preferred alternative, in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics. As discussed under Impact ECON-1, construction of the water conveyance facilities would be anticipated to result in a net temporary increase of income and employment in the Delta region. Construction-related employment from the project is estimated to peak at 2,427 FTE jobs in year 3. Total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) would peak in year 12, at 8,673 FTE jobs. Direct agricultural employment would be reduced by an estimated 16 FTE jobs, while total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) associated with agricultural employment would fall by 57 FTE jobs. Throughout the five-county Delta region, population and employment would expand as a result of the construction of water conveyance facilities, as discussed under Impacts ECON-1 and ECON-2.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 26 regarding exports. The changes being sought do not include any changes to increase existing water rights or pursuing application for new water rights.</p> <p>As described in Impact ECON-6 under Alternative 4A in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, construction of conveyance facilities would convert land from existing agricultural uses to project-related construction uses, and agricultural land could also be affected by changes in water quality and other conditions that would affect crop productivity. These direct effects on agricultural land are described under Impacts AG-1 and AG-2 in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources. Total value of irrigated crop production in the Delta would decline on average by \$5.3 million per year during the construction period, with total irrigated crop acreage declining by about 4,700 acres. Other effects related to production costs, travel time, and loss of investments in production facilities and standing orchards and vineyards would also occur as a result of facilities construction. When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the alternative. While the compensation to property owners would reduce the severity of economic effects related to the loss of agricultural land, it would not constitute mitigation for any related physical impact.</p>
1843	4	If water is removed above the Delta, it will increase the salinity in the Delta. To counteract the salinity increase, salinity gates are going to be put in place. These salinity gates will be placed at locations in the Delta such as Georgianna Slough, Montezuma Slough and Old River. Unfortunately, this will block boat traffic requiring boaters to radio and request openings for the gates. By having to request openings, this slows the traffic down because they have to wait for the gates to open and close on either side of the locks. Not only will it make traffic slow down, it will also put more pollution in the water because the boats will be sitting at idle and waiting rather than cruising straight through.	<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. 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.</p> <p>Modeling used in the assessment of Alternative 4A assumed no operation of the Montezuma Slough Salinity Control Gates, but the project description assumes continued operations of the Delta Cross Channel gates and the Suisun Marsh Salinity Control Gates as part of the CVP and SWP, as described in Section 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS.</p>
1843	5	I understand one reason for bypassing the Delta is the condition of the levees in the event of an earthquake. These levees have been in place for many years and never has an earthquake caused a problem. Not only that, it would be much cheaper to maintain the levees annually to make sure there is not a problem. Not only will the tunnels not help this	Regarding the part of the comment pertaining to the levees never having been affected by an earthquake, as described in Section 9.1.1.3.1. Delta in Chapter 9, the Delta region has experienced low-level seismic shaking from nearby and regional faults since 1800, with no earthquakes greater than magnitude 5.0. However, because the period since 1800 is relatively short on a geological time scale, projections must be

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>problem, but they will simply create more dangers. For example, if the gaskets in the tunnels begin leaking water, it will get into the ground and cause sinkholes that could be dangerous to people and farming equipment.</p>	<p>made of the probability of ground shaking occurring in the future. As described in Chapter 9 and in Section 3E.2.4.2 Ground Acceleration (Ground Shaking) in Appendix 3E, the Delta is subject to moderate to strong ground shaking from seismic sources from both within and outside the Delta., with a peak ground acceleration of up to 0.46g, based on a return interval of 475 years. Hence, a low level of seismic shaking in geologically recent history is not a reliable indicator of future shaking hazard.</p> <p>Regarding the part of the comment pertaining to maintaining the levees (instead of constructing the conveyance facilities), please refer to Master Response 4, Alternatives.</p> <p>Regarding the part of the comment pertaining tunnel gaskets leaking, the potential impacts of an uncontrolled release of water from the tunnels as a result of seismic shaking are described in GEO-7 in Chapter 9. GEO-9 also describes how the tunnels would be constructed to withstand seismically-induced ground movements, such as high performance gaskets, which would maintain water tightness at the joints in the concrete segments.</p>
1843	6	<p>One option that would actually produce more water would be desalination. By taking the ocean water and desalinating it, more fresh water would be available than there is now. Not only would there be fresh water but the salt could be used for other purposes such as seasoning food.</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.</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>
1843	7	<p>I hope you will stop any planning to install or build the Delta Tunnels. As a fisherman, boater and nature lover, I would really hate to see our environment ruined.</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 Clean Water Act and federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental.</p>
1844	1	<p>Please accept this e-mail as my strong objection to the idea of twin tunnels. This proposal is only to satisfy those who live in the Southern part of our state with more water. This idea shows no consideration of how it would affect the Delta, the fishing and the economy in our area. It is truly a horrible idea.</p>	<p>More than two-thirds of the residents of the state and more than two million acres of highly productive farm land receive water exported from the Delta watershed. The proposed project aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. However, the project proponents have no authority to designate what water is used for.</p> <p>One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board.</p> <p>The Lead Agencies acknowledge the discussion of community character in Chapter 16 of the EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A (Socioeconomics) identifies the unique features of the Delta and describes the potential effects on Delta communities. Please see chapter 15 for a discussion on impacts to recreation. Impacts to agriculture are identified and discussed in Chapter 14; project proponents have proposed measures that would support and protect agricultural production in the Delta by securing agricultural easements and/or by seeking opportunities to protect and enhance agriculture with a focus on maintaining economic activity on agricultural lands. Please see Master Response 18 for more information on agricultural</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			mitigation.
1845	1	From what I have read, I believe the twin tunnels project will degrade the Delta and seriously affect the livelihoods of numerous professions in our area.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 26 (Delta as A Place).
1845	2	This does not include the unintended consequences sure to occur since the scientific studies are incomplete at best. As far as I can tell, the main beneficiaries of this project are the west side corporate farmers. It is outrageous to sacrifice a national treasure, our delta, for them. Add my name to those strongly opposed to this project.	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 California WaterFix proposed conveyance facilities and Master Response 26 for additional discussion regarding exports and water rights.
1846	1	As a Sacramento area citizen, I am absolutely opposed to the Delta tunnels project. Instead, make agricultural users responsible for managing their water resources efficiently, including setting up rainwater capture systems for their areas. Look at how Australian farmers have dealt with the same issue to ensure their survival and also improve profitability. Investment by agribusinesses now would solve immediate and long-term water needs in drought-prone California. On the other hand, the Delta tunnels proposal would make these vital farmers dependent on political will, as well as cause a public backlash over environmental damage that could be avoided with more visionary solutions.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. Through the Legislature and through executive agencies, California has embraced water conservation on numerous fronts, as have many California water agencies. Many of these efforts are highlighted in Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management, EIR/EIS, which describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply, including recycled water. While these elements are not proposed as part of the project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.
1847	1	Please ensure our natural habitat is not destroyed. Rather let's build antisalination plants. Let's limit the amount of water-hogging plantings and overhaul what's allowable for needed foodstuffs and what's mainly an export like the almonds.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. Please see Master Response 7 regarding desalination.
1848	1	Millionaire farmers on the Agricultural committee have greased the wheels against the consumer, the farmers in California have drilled beneath the water table and taxpayers will be paying billions to repair the damage. Stop the madness.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1849	1	California water rights policy is madness. It's time to overhaul the allocation rights that were created without any understanding of how the states hydrologic cycles and sensitive ecosystems function. Jerry Brown is locked in a mindset of the past. We don't need more corporate mega projects and continued plundering of our precious estuarine environments. We need sane and sweeping changes to our existing water allocation policies and a reduction in corporate agribusiness giveaways that continue to degrade the ecology of the Delta while fostering unsustainable practices such as subsidizing the growing of nut tree crops in West Valley. No more!	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The State Water Resources Control Board, not DWR, is responsible for decisions relating to water rights. DWR holds water rights approved by the State Water Resources Control Board but does not have the power or authority to issue water rights to others. Additionally, the proposed project does not seek any new water

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			rights nor include any regulatory actions that would affect water rights holders other than DWR, Reclamation, and SWP and CVP contractors. All water exported by the SWP and CVP is the subject of the existing water rights of those two agencies. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives analyzed in the EIR/EIS only include the use of water from existing SWP and CVP water rights or voluntary water transfers from other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders.
1850	1	The citizens of northern California are doing a great deal to lessen the water that is used while water is scarce. Other groups need to start doing their share - and then the tunnels will not be needed.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1851	1	This decision is going to have dire consequences from which there will be no return. Why are we doing this?	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. Please also refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
1852	1	How much money is enough? Stop this project. Human greed is destroying the natural world that sustains us. Please, for the love of God, stop.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds 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>
1853	1	Please leave our waters in California alone. We have suffered enough!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1854	1	The Doble family has received your flier and we are outraged with the Governor's proposal. We need to protect our water from being shipped south. Our state provides the nation with agricultural products and our farmers are being put on the back burner. This is not a fix. A fix is Southern California building their own dams and reservoirs. It's time for this state to divide and become North California and South California.	<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. 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. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal and state regulating agencies, and Endangered Species Act compliance. 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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).
1855	1	<p>Why is this wrong?</p> <p>For [long-term] water use, California needs a water lock at the Carquinez Strait to regulate the amount of water that flows to the Bay/ocean. Like regulating a water faucet.</p> <p>Our dams will not release large volumes of water. The Delta will stay full. Install a fish access with water flowing constantly through the fish access like [at] the Columbia River. Inside the Columbia River Lock is a glass window [where] you can see the fish migrate. Boat traffic will be managed as well as keeping salt water from entering the Delta. [During] years of heavy rainfall, open the gates wide.</p> <p>We need to save water for all of California.</p> <p>Why is this wrong?</p>	<p>As described in Appendix 3A of the EIR/EIS, the Initial Screening Conveyance Alternative C3, Through Delta Conveyance with West Delta Salinity, would include construction of an operable barrier near Chipps Island with boat locks and fish passage facilities to maintain a fresh water lake in the Delta and continue to provide water through existing channels to existing SWP and CVP south Delta intakes. This Initial Screening Conveyance Alternative was eliminated from further evaluation because this concept would not meet the project objectives of a brackish water system in the Delta that would support the estuarine habitat that support endangered aquatic species in the Delta as required by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service, and would reduce the ability of fish passage for anadromous fish. This Initial Screening Conveyance Alternative also would not meet the coequal goal under the 2009 Delta Reform Act of "protecting, restoring, and enhancing the Delta ecosystem."</p>
1856	1	No, no, no. How many times do we the people have to say no? Seed the clouds! Please tell me why we are not seeding the clouds.	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.
1857	1	As a resident of San Joaquin County, a large and important agricultural area which delivers \$3 billion in annual agricultural production, I am opposed to the assault on our area that Governor Brown's proposed "WaterFix" presents. This plan steals water from us, trampling over prior rights dating over a century, and will inflict severe economic damage on us residents, farmers, and the state.	By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports). Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.
1857	2	Rather than spending \$15 billion (plus overruns) of taxpayer funds on this scheme which develops no new water source whatsoever, it would be much more prudent to demand that such an expenditure not be used to divert water from one set of users to another, but instead be invested in developing new sources. Possibilities include new dam projects, new desalination facilities in Southern California, or other viable schemes including mediating and settling the dispute with British Columbia so California businesses could purchase water from them and bottle it for home delivery in Southern California. No doubt creative minds could find other new sources of water, something that merely diverting water will never do.	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. 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>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. Additionally, please refer to Master Response 7 for information on desalination and why it was not included as a project alternative.</p>
1858	1	Taking enormous amounts of water from the Sacramento River is a bad plan. We need the water where it is, available to grow crops, and to keep the Delta at least somewhat healthy.	For more information regarding agricultural mitigation please see Master Response 18.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1858	2	My understanding is that there is no new water capturing/storage planned to compensate for the water that would be taken. How about finding ways to capture and store more water first?	For more information refer to Master Response 37 (Water Storage).Also, please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management and Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives.
1859	1	I have been strongly opposed to the Bay-Delta Conservation Plan since the early scoping meetings began 7 years ago, and oppose the plan even more today under the California WaterFix. Nothing has changed in either of the plans, merely the name. I need not list all of the comments in opposition to "the tunnels" that have not already been expressed or documented since the early days of the Bay Area Delta Conservation Plan. Hopefully, the comments will not fall on deaf ears as they seem to have in the past.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1860	1	This is the most idiotic thing I have ever heard of. Why do the people in Northern California have to subsidize an area that has [its] own water? I recently read on Facebook of a mansion in Southern California that used over 1 million gallons of water and paid 90 [thousand dollars] for it. What a waste. Is this what we are being asked to subsidize? Stop the potential rape of the northern half of California.	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. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
1861	1	The plan will permanently destroy the Delta landscape that rowers and motor boaters love.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. Discussions about impacts to boating under the preferred alternative, 4A, can be found in Impacts REC-3, 7, and 10 in Chapter 15, Recreation. Permanent impacts (those remaining after construction is completed) would only be centered around the three intakes in the north Delta and around Clifton Court Forebay.
1861	2	Environmental justice communities, who depend on subsistence fishing, will also face food and health insecurities as a result of increased contaminants, specifically mercury contamination, in fish and wildlife populations associated with reduced outflows that help with dilution.	Additional detail related to microcystis (due to longer residence times of water) and mercury and selenium related to subsistence fishing was added to Chapter 28, Environmental Justice, in the RDEIR/SDEIS. As described under each alternative in Chapter 28 for Impact PH-3, the associated increase in human consumption of mercury caused by the action alternatives would depend upon the selection of the fishing location (and associated local fish body burdens), and the relative proportion of different Delta fish consumed. Different fish species would suffer bioaccumulation at different rates associated with the specific species, therefore the specific spectrum of fish consumed by a population would determine the effect of increased mercury body burdens in individual fish species. These confounding factors make demonstration of precise impacts on human populations infeasible. However, because minority populations are known to practice subsistence fishing and consume fish exceeding US EPA reference doses, any increase in the fish body burden of mercury may contribute to an existing adverse effect. Because subsistence fishing is specifically associated with minority populations in the Delta compared to the population at large this effect would be disproportionate on those populations. This effect would be adverse. Please refer to Master Response 14.
1861	3	We are experiencing drought conditions in the Delta which will only worsen if the planned Delta Tunnels are constructed.	The Proposed Project was developed to improve Delta habitat and SWP/CVP water supply reliability. 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			exported supplies. The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change with continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).
1861	4	Less expensive and less environmentally destructive alternatives to the Delta Tunnels were largely ignored when the plan was finalized.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1862	1	No tunnel to Southern California. Have them drink treated salt water. We need the water.	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.
1863	1	My wife and I are very disturbed that there is even a thought of building twin tunnels to transport water under the Delta to southern California. This would be devastating to the environment and the economy of our area! As an engineer with a background in soil mechanics, I can only see major problems ahead if such a project is undertaken. This project must be abandoned!	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. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply). For more information on soil see Chapter 10, EIR/EIS.
1865	1	I hope to find out why a plan of this magnitude is not going before the voters, or even the legislature.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1865	2	I stand with thousands of fellow fly-fisherman and those who are trying to save what's left of California's native fish populations and urge the Governor to seek a better alternative than the tunnels.	The commenter does not offer any evidence on how the project would result in aquatic impacts related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1866	1	I am adamantly opposed to the Delta tunnel. It is solving no water issues for the state and is hurting the Northern California residents and farmers. [It is] also adding billions of unneeded expenses.	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. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.
1866	2	Where are the experts when it comes to water solutions? Unfortunately special interests	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		and politics come in to play instead of honestly looking for solutions.	and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. Please refer to Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives.
1866	3	No on the Delta tunnel!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
1867	1	California's agricultural abundance includes more than 400 commodities. The state produces nearly half of U.S.-grown fruits, nuts, and vegetables. Across the nation, U.S. consumers regularly purchase several crops produced solely in California. The Fruit Basket of California is the San Joaquin Valley. The proposed "WaterFix" does not provide a single drop of new water and could in fact severely impact [the] already drought-stricken Delta and San Joaquin.	<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.</p> <p>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.</p>
1867	2	Do not waste our money -- \$15 billion should better serve the people of California, not hurt the Delta and San Joaquin Valley. Read the statistics again. The crops are not grown in San Francisco or Los Angeles. They are grown in central California and they provide nearly 50% of all US grown fruits, nuts and vegetables . . . Those are the simple facts.	DWR acknowledges your opposition to the project. Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on the costs of project implementation.
1867	3	I say no to the Delta tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
1868	1	I'm writing to voice my opposition to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California Water Fix plan. This plan is not good for our area's economy, it has the potential to cause ecological damage, it provides no new water, and the cost of the project is totally ridiculous. There are other much more economically effective methods to achieve the same results. As a voting citizen of San Joaquin County, please register my opposition to this project.	<p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p>
1869	1	The plan to build the Delta tunnels is a bad one. It would harm the Delta environment and the livelihoods of many people. In my many years in health care and as a farm girl, I've seen that when people meddle too much with the natural order, they make things worse -- whether it's treating every malady with another pill, performing procedures that don't enhance the quality of life, introducing "improvements" into an ecosystem that works with beauty and economy, or moving water from one end of the state to another. Why do we think we can do better than nature? Find a better solution than this. The Delta tunnel plan is crazy and a band-aid to a bigger problem.	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.
1870	1	After extensive reading of the DEIR and EIR, in addition to State Fish & Wildlife Biologist reports/conclusions of a negative impact on the fragile Delta ecosystem, I am writing in strong opposition to pursuing this reckless storage and tunnel transport proposal. Alternatively, force private agriculture and homeowners/builders to find and develop their own, new, renewable sources of water before continuing to poach the delicate Bay-Delta ecosystem.	The commenter does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1871	1	It is with great sadness that I watch our great Delta and the contribution it makes to our way of life be sacrificed on the altar of corporate greed. It is shame on this generation of political leadership that refuses to rise to the responsibility of protecting a national treasure. Our Delta will become a sewer if fresh water inflows are reduced. Please stop the Delta tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environment impacts 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. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).
1872	1	I am very much against the plan to divert water from the tunnels project as it seems to have a very narrow focus on who it will benefit. As I understand, it will do more harm than good for the overall health of the Delta and related regions. As this project doesn't create any new water sources it will only reduce the amount of fresh water to the lower regions of the Delta. This project is fated for disaster and will only benefit those to the south at the expense of jobs, quality of living and environmental health!	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. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
1873	1	We have lived in Discovery Bay for 16 years now and enjoy the lifestyle it provides. We take our kids and grandkids out in our boat on the weekends and enjoy it immensely. I hope to be able to leave this wonderful lifestyle to our children and grandchildren. The tunnels will change all that.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.
1874	1	I do not think the special interests involved have a right to the commons, the ecosystem, [or] the water that is intended to nourish all species. Do not establish these tunnels.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1875	1	Please reconsider. Don't kill off what little ecology and endangered species we have left. Our children will only read about salmon and other fish species in textbooks, never seeing them in person. How [will] children and adults learn to respect ecosystems and their inhabitants when the lawmakers (adults) are killing it in front of them?	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. 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. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
1876	1	I am strongly opposed to the Delta tunnels plan. This plan will cost billions, not adequately address our water problems, and will result in additional environmental damage to the Delta and Bay ecosystems.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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>
1877	1	<p>As a homeowner of more than 45 years, I believe there are many changes to the building codes of private and public buildings that could greatly increase water conservation. As a biologist, I am greatly concerned with the likely negative consequences</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 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 project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change with continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).</p>
1878	1	<p>During a time of historic drought, we need sensible, locally-based actions to conserve and manage our precious water resources. Another giant infrastructure project in the middle of the already devastated Bay-Delta ecosystem, accompanied by enormous public debt, is not the answer for the State of California. Much as I support Governor Brown's many laudable policies and positive actions on a number of important issues, this one is sheer folly. Please stand up and prevent this foolishness from going forward.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>
1879	1	<p>We keep doing this! The people have voted to stop ideas like this -- the famous one being the peripheral canal -- time and time again. I expect it from some political corners, but not Jerry Brown!</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>
1880	1	<p>We in the Bay Area do not want to kill our bay! It isn't the Enormous Cesspool Area!</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</p>

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>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p>
1884	1	Save the Bay-Delta 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.</p>
1885	1	The Bay is a treasure to all who live nearby. Please help us preserve it for generations to come!	<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>
1886	1	The Delta Tunnels project is an environmental and economic 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>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <p>Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the BDCP would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p>
1887	1	I am very concerned that the Delta tunnels will seriously impact the Delta, with its valuable wildlife and ecosystem.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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).
1888	1	This is an outrageous idea, and you should be ashamed. This project will have a devastating impact on the Bay-Delta ecosystem.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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>
1889	1	Please do not let this move forward. Protect the Delta and Bay. This is not a good "fix."	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1890	1	Jerry, this is not a good option. You can do better.	<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>
1891	1	No suspicious water grabs, 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>Please refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports/Area of Origin/Water Rights) and 41 (Transparency).</p>
1893	1	This is wrong, wrong, wrong, for so many reasons. Do you want to be the person who destroyed the Bay-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>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
1894	1	Be the environmental champion I thought you were.	<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>
1895	1	We need desperately a real water fix. Not this.	<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>
1896	1	We need to protect the fish species in the Delta [and] the San Francisco Bay -- it's important to all of us!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1897	1	No Delta tunnels project! It's bad for the region's ecology and endangered species. That comes before helping money-making goals.	<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>
1898	1	Please stop this attack on Delta waters.	<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
1899	1	I am very concerned about the devastating consequences to the environment if the Delta tunnel plan is approved.	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p> <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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>