

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
2001	1	<p>I have lived in the San Joaquin County for my entire life and I regularly row on the Delta on a daily basis. I am opposed to the current WaterFix plan because I personally know how fragile our ecosystem is in the Delta. Creating the "tunnel" will destroy the San Joaquin Delta.</p> <p>Please, Governor Brown, stop this project from occurring.</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>
2002	1	<p>I really think that the Governor should take a better look at what he's proposing. Not only are the Delta tunnels going to ruin the Delta ecosystem, but the \$15 billion could be used to help build the Sites and the Temperance Flats Reservoirs.</p> <p>More water storage outweighs what the Delta tunnels will accomplish. For instance, if the New Melones dam wasn't built, the farmers in the SSJID (South San Joaquin irrigation District) would be in serious trouble. We survived this year because that dam was built years ago, and it's a shame that there hasn't been another one built since!</p>	<p>Please note that the project was initiated by former Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, who was twice elected by a majority of California voters. The process has continued under the administration of his successor, Edmund G. Brown, Jr. Hence, the project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole.</p> <p>The proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 (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. Rather, the scope and purpose of the proposed project is much more limited. As explained in Chapter 2 Project Objectives and Purpose and Need of the Final EIR/EIS, the fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the State Water Project (SWP) system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and Central Valley Project (CVP) south-of-Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework with statutory and contractual obligations.</p> <p>Additional water storage was eliminated from consideration in the Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS through the alternatives development and screening process (discussed in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives). As such, the proposed project does not propose storage as a project component. Although the proposed project would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, Alternative 4A is a stand-alone project which demonstrates independent utility just as future storage projects would demonstrate.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives) and Master Response 37 (Water Storage) for additional information.</p>
2004	1	<p>Like most Californians, I am very concerned about the ability of [our] agencies to provide enough quality water to continue our way of life. We all need to realize that there will need to be changes in the way we gain water, store, and distribute and use water. There are a lot of valuable ways to help fix our water problems, but the twin tunnels project is not one of them.</p> <p>Whatever we do to "fix" our current situation, we must not waste our resources with projects that are wrong in so many ways.</p> <p>Let's not waste billions on the twin tunnels project as it does nothing to improve the availability of water; it only moves the limited fresh water that we have to areas that need it, but does not address the damage these tunnels will do to our ecosystem, or our economy.</p>	<p>It is important to note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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>
2004	2	<p>We need to actually find ways to increase the supply of fresh water, learn how to store it most effectively and learn how to not use as much water in all the things we do that require fresh water.</p> <p>Please stop the twin tunnels project.</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management.</p>
2005	1	<p>Please explain to me how diverting billions of gallons of water to Southern California will "produce more water."</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. Water delivered to the SWP and CVP water contractors participating in proposed project would be within the existing contract amounts to serve agricultural lands that have been cultivated and existing and planned community populations. As described in Chapter 5, Water Supply, of the EIR/S, it is anticipated that climate change would result in more frequent and more severe rainfall events and less snowfall than under historic conditions. These rainfall events would result in periods of time when the capacity of the existing intakes would not be adequate. Therefore, the proposed project would provide the maximum capacity in the intakes and tunnels during those periods of time to convey water during extremely wet periods to areas south of the Delta for storage and use during drier times. The proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase flows in the wet winter months when the river flows are high to improve conditions for aquatic resources. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries in drier periods. The north Delta and south Delta intakes would only be used to divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements.</p>
2007	1	<p>Take fresh water, upriver by Sacramento, away from the Delta and pass it underground not through the Delta. Passing this fresh water through the Delta would keep salt water from encroaching and ruining our land.</p>	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS.</p>
2007	2	<p>It would keep our levees from drying out and they would not fail if a surge of water [came] against them in winter or spring snowmelt.</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the EIR/EIS.</p>
2007	3	<p>Southern Governor Brown says the water will only be diverted when the Delta has surplus water. Southern plantings of thousands of acres of permanent crops have been</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
		planted that were not supposed to have been. Water was diverted numerous times when it shouldn't have been. Southern water diverters have had so much surplus water that they have been selling water to others at unbelievable prices. I would bet most of you that are going to decide the future of the Delta already know what's going on.	
2007	4	Let Southern interests take all the fresh water away from the Delta, let the Delta salt up, kill the Delta fishery and also harm San Francisco Bay. Let southern water districts sell more water, make more profit for them.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The SWP and CVP operations under the action alternatives would only deliver water under existing water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board to DWR and Reclamation for use by the SWP and CVP with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. Water delivered to the SWP and CVP water contractors participating in proposed project would be within the existing contract amounts to serve agricultural lands that have been cultivated and existing and planned community populations. The project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities, including operations to protect water quality, can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html).</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). Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p>
2007	5	Grant [Southern California farmers] water in perpetuity. I have 1,867 patented water rights which "shut up" southern Governor Brown threatened to take this year and send to 1,950 water right southern interests.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies. The proposed project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the proposed project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative. It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under the proposed project as compared to exports under No Action Alternative based on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. Although long-term total exports under the proposed project would be similar to the amount water exported in</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.
2007	6	I am 72 years old; my grandson Raymond is eighteen. He began farming the 252 acres this year. Please don't destroy the Delta, our farm, our way of life.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).
2008	1	These Twin Delta Tunnels must not be built! This is a ploy by Jerry Brown to send water from Northern California to big agribusiness in Southern California with no regard as to the consequences for the Delta area, the fish, the wildlife, the environment, local farms and businesses, the people and the availability of water to Northern Californians.	Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. 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.
2008	2	The iconic Sacramento River will be deprived of fresh water so that minimal yields of untreated and unreliable water can be sent south. No new water is coming from the plan. This is ridiculous.	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).
2008	3	This [is] the second attempt to steal water from Northern California. Jerry Brown's father tried when he put his Peripheral Canal plan on the ballot. That failed miserably when something like 97% of Northern Californians voted against it even though the south had and has a much larger population! Population numbers must not make it right.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
2008	4	There is no economic benefit from this project. It will cost tens of billions of dollars with only a possibility of getting any water versus the consequences. That money needs to be spent statewide instead, to improve infrastructure and not to benefit big business once again!	As discussed under Impact ECON-1 of Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, 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. 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. Under Alternative 4A, additional regional employment and income could create net positive effects on the character of Delta communities. 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. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
2008	5	The fact that the proponents of the EIR omitted facts and actually lied about others is criminal. The people don't even have a public vote.	<p>The Federal and State Lead Agencies have done their best to make the EIR/EIS for the project as fair, objective, and complete as possible. These agencies readily acknowledge, however, that the document addresses a number of topics for which some scientific uncertainty exists. Such uncertainty can give rise to differing opinions as to what conclusions may be reached.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 32 of the Final EIR/EIS and Master Response 40 for information regarding outreach conducted for California WaterFix (and previously the BDCP). More information on how DWR has developed the project in an open and transparent manner is provided in Master Response 41.</p>
2009	1	<p>We live in the area that is designated as the "Delta" and are against the building of the tunnels. The "Delta" is suffering already as a result of water problems and the tunnels will only make it worse.</p> <p>Southern California needs to find other ways of solving their water issues.</p>	<p>It is important to note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>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 1 [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 Response 26 (Effects on Northern CA), Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), and Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place) for additional information.</p>
2009	2	Stop the tunnels. Governor Brown is wrong!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
2010	1	<p>This diversion plan is bad for the Delta and for California. The plan is designed to benefit huge corporate farms and agribusiness in the western San Joaquin Valley at the expense of the environment and the people of California. The selenium problem make these areas unsuitable for farming without a huge influx of clean water.</p> <p>As a resident of Southern California, I vigorously oppose this project. It is primarily proposed for the benefit of business at the expense of our money and water, not to mention the impact on wildlife and the environment.</p>	For more information regarding updated selenium analysis please see Section 8.3.1.7 Constituent-Specific Considerations Use in the Assessment in Appendix A Chapter 8 of the RDEIR/SDEIS.
2011	1	Shipping the water to Southern California is not going to provide more water, it will merely spread the water out over the state. Many experts believe the fine balance that	The proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high to improve conditions for aquatic resources in the Delta. The

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		makes the Delta so special will be jarred if the water flow to the Delta is impeded.	water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods.
2011	2	The proposed tunnels will cost many millions of dollars but will not provide for any additional water. The risk is that the diversion of water from the Delta will allow the salt to be more intrusive, resulting in problems in growing crops in the region as well as rattling the sensitive ecosystem. If the islands become non-productive for agriculture, then there will be a domino effect with the islands not being maintained. The whole Delta way of life will begin to crumble and the plentiful natural elements making up the Delta will vanish over time.	<p>Salinity in the Delta is a function of the amount and timing of freshwater input from the major tributaries, tidal action from San Francisco Bay, and exports from the Delta. During the late winter and spring months of seasonally elevated flows, and in wet years, seawater intrusion is limited and the Delta has mostly low salinity. During low-flow summer and fall months, and during dry years, lower freshwater flows result in greater amounts of seawater intrusion. Staff from DWR and USBR constantly monitor Delta water quality conditions and adjust operations of the SWP and CVP in real time as necessary to meet water quality objectives set by the State Water Resource Control Board protection of agricultural water supply, municipal and industrial drinking water supply, and fish and wildlife beneficial uses. See section 4.3.4 for a discussion on the proposed projects effects on water quality, salinity and electrical conductivity.</p> <p>Effects of the alternatives on salinity levels are described in Chapter 8, Water Quality. Modeling results indicate that the implementation of the water conveyance facilities may positively or adversely affect in-Delta water quality, depending on a number of factors including location, time of year, and hydrologic conditions. See tables in Appendices 8E through 8N for specific results related to various water quality constituents (including bromide and chloride).</p> <p>In addition to potential effects associated with the project and alternatives, modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the proposed project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.</p>
2011	3	My father and others over the years have made their living by maintaining these islands so that the protective peat dirt could provide some amazing foods. Why should all their toils over the years be put in jeopardy because real estate developers built homes in areas where they shouldn't have? It is ironic that you want to take our water which may end the Delta as we know it, and you want us to pay for it. I have never believed that two wrongs make a right.	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.
2011	4	Please stop this nonsense as our lives are at stake. It is unfortunate there is a lack of water in some parts of the state, [but] putting us farmers out of business is not the answer.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. Senior water rights holders are not affected by implementation of action alternatives. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation would be able to pump from the proposed north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the proposed project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S.
2011	5	As we are enduring the drought that affects the whole state, let us put our thoughts and funds toward providing more water storage to preserve what we get and have some left over to use when there is a lack of rainfall.	Please see Master Response 37 regarding water storage.
2012	1	I want you to know, as a California taxpayer, I am not in favor of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta tunnels. It will cause harm to the Delta.	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			agricultural lands. Please see Master Response 18 for more information on agricultural mitigation.
2012	2	It would be a severely negative impact on Delta communities, nearly 4 million people, including 2,500 farmers. The cost is way more than we need to be spending.	DWR acknowledges your opposition to the project.
2012	3	I don't think we should even be sending our water down south, unless we have a surplus. If people want to live in the southern part of California, let them pay the price to desalt their water! I believe this is just as big a waste of our money as the high-speed rail.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 63. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
2012	4	This won't fix any water needs!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
2013	1	This revised iteration of the BDCP, proposed Alternative 4A and referred to as California WaterFix, proposes to make physical and operational improvements to the State and Federal water projects in the Delta claiming to protect reliable future water supplies and to restore and protect ecosystem health in the Delta. Unfortunately, California WaterFix fails to accomplish either of these purposes and the RDEIR/RDEIS inadequately analyzes impacts to the Delta ecosystem, water quality and supply, and communities.	<p>Since 2006, the propose project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
2013	2	The Town of Discovery Bay Community Services District Board of Directors believe that implementation of the BDCP, and particularly the construction of the dual conveyance system allegedly designed to reduce the amount of fresh Sacramento River water flowing into and through the Delta, would cause additional and significant deterioration of an already sensitive Delta ecosystem. The Town submitted comments to that effect in June 2014 in response to the initial release of the BDCP and DEIR/DEIS. California WaterFix does nothing to remedy the concerns expressed therein, but rather heightens those concerns due to the removal of environmental protection and enhancement measures, and the Town readopts its comments previously submitted.	Please see responses to Letter 803 submitted by the Town of Discovery Bay on the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS.
2013	3	The proposed project would have significant negative impacts to boating and recreation in the Delta. The Town [of Discovery Bay]'s location in the heart of the Delta makes it an ideal community to benefit from all the Delta has to offer. Town residents and visitors utilize the Delta waterways for boating and recreation year-round, and such activities are vital to the cultural and economic well-being of the Town.	The proposed project may impact recreational opportunities including impacts on hunting, fishing, swimming, and boating. Mitigation is proposed to reduce these impacts; however some impacts may remain significant due to the long-term nature of the temporary construction related impacts. Please see Chapter 15, Recreation of the FEIR/EIS, and Section 4.3.11 of the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS for more detail on the impacts of the proposed project on recreational opportunities and the proposed mitigation.
2013	4	<p>The Town [of Discovery Bay] obtains all of its municipal water supply from a system of groundwater wells throughout the community. Although Town pumping occurs in the confined aquifer underlying the community, the proximity to the</p> <p>Delta waterways and neighboring agricultural operations which apply Delta water raises concerns that the Town's municipal supply may be impacted in the future as Delta waterways become more saline.</p>	<p>The assessment of the project alternatives in Chapter 8, Water Quality, shows that the preferred alternative 4A would have substantially less effect on Delta water quality such that significant impacts were identified for electrical conductivity (EC) at Emmaton and Prisoners Point and are to be mitigated through real-time operations that could not be completely represented in the modeling on which the EC assessment is based. Mercury associated with the limited tidal habitat restoration that would be implemented Results in less than significant with the proposed project.</p> <p>Additionally, there are numerous water quality monitoring stations at locations throughout the Delta that are currently operating and will continue to be operational in the future. These stations are operated by the United States Geological Survey, the United States Bureau of Reclamation, the California Department of Water Resources, the Interagency Ecological Program, and numerous local agencies. Monitoring locations</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>already present in Old River near Discovery Bay are sufficient to support and inform these activities with regards to salinity and organic carbon. Monitoring of mercury and selenium will be further defined in site specific monitoring and management plans associated with the restoration areas.</p> <p>For additional information regarding water quality, please see Master Response 14.</p>
2013	5	Similarly, the Town [of Discovery Bay] discharges treated wastewater pursuant to an NPDES [National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System] permit. The conditions included in the permit were created and are dependent on the ambient conditions of the Delta. The proposed project will alter the makeup of the Delta which may affect the ongoing viability of the permit conditions. The RDEIR/RDEIS fail to consider possible impacts to the Town's municipal water supply and treated wastewater discharge operations.	Please refer to Master Response 15 (NPDES permit holders) for information on the impacts on Discovery Bay and the NPDES permit.
2013	6	The RDEIR/RDEIS should assess the environmental impact with respect to implementing California WaterFix and the potential of levee failure by examining the consequences each may have for the other. The RDEIR/RDEIS cites levee fragility as a reason to build an isolated conveyance for Sacramento River water. Levee concerns are also referenced on the California WaterFix website. However, the RDEIR/RDEIS offers no analysis of how levee failures would affect the short- and long-term water operations of the proposed project. Also lacking in the RDEIR/RDEIS, and of great import to the Town [of Discovery Bay] and other Delta communities, is an analysis of how implementing the project would affect the State's priorities for investing in Delta levees. This potential impact is illustrated by the fact that scoring systems of levee-project proposals for State funding award points for expected benefits to "export water supply reliability." The RDEIR/RDEIS fails to analyze whether levee maintenance, and the communities and economies dependent on that maintenance, will suffer impacts from the proposed project.	<p>Please see Appendix 6A of the FEIR/EIS and Sections 6A.2 and 6A.3 of the RDEIR/SDEIS for discussion on existing levee improvement programs and funding mechanisms, which would not be affected by the BDCP/CWF. Levees are an important public safety resource and the proposed project would not change levee policy or replace ongoing programs and grant projects aimed at facilitating and supporting levee improvements in or outside the Delta. It recognized that levee maintenance and safety in the Delta is an important issue for the residents of the Delta and for statewide interests.</p> <p>Please see Section 6A.6 of the RDEIR/SDEIS for a discussion on levees modified by construction of the California WaterFix (CWF), including responsibilities of the project proponents.</p> <p>Before and/or during construction of the CWF water conveyance facilities, project proponents will explore opportunities with local reclamation districts and the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB) to address potential conflicts regarding levee maintenance, inspection, and flood fighting activities on project and non-project levees. DWR will look to enter into agreements with local reclamation districts with jurisdiction in the Delta to ensure levee management activities by both government and local agencies are not interrupted during construction or operation of the water conveyance facilities. In addition, DWR will comply with all applicable flood protection requirements and regulations to ensure flood neutrality during construction and operations of the CWF. Please also see Final EIR/EIS, Appendix 6A regarding flooding and levees.</p>
2013	7	The technical evaluation, public review, and regulatory approval process of the proposed project is being subverted. Recently, DWR and USBR [Reclamation] jumped the gun to file a water rights application for new points of diversion for the tunnels with the State Water Resources Control Board, assuming that the project complies with all applicable state and federal laws and regulations. On the contrary, compliance is highly doubtful. In addition to the water rights filing, USBR petitioned the Army Corps of Engineers for permission to perform dredge and fill construction activities for the water tunnels long before the project has received other necessary approvals. This heightens the perception that DWR and USBR are trying to force the project through administrative channels without proper review and without considering realistic and prudent alternatives. Moreover, this abridgment of the regulatory approval process effectively curbs the opportunity for public review and participation. The agencies' actions with the State Water Board and the Corps of Engineers are premature and should be withdrawn. This issue is too important, with too many significant statewide impacts, to act presumptively.	Please refer to Master Response 45, regarding permitting processes and the appropriateness of this approach and Master Response 29, regarding the Endangered Species Act and timing for completing the ESA Section 7 process. Decisions about approval of a particular alternative are not included in the EIR/EIS.
2013	8	The dual conveyance system, in its present proposed alignment, crosses directly in,	Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		through and adjacent to the Town of Discovery Bay on its way to the Clifton Court Forebay. The environmental impacts that will be caused as a result of the construction and ongoing project maintenance will forever change the relationship between the Discovery Bay community, the environmental stewardship of the Delta, and the economic and significant cultural resources of the Delta region. These significant impacts are not adequately addressed in the RDEIR/RDEIS.	<p>agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water timing 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>Please also refer to Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, regarding impacts to regional economics, changes in community character, and effects on recreational economics and Chapter 18 for impacts to cultural resources.</p>
2013	9	The proposed BDCP and California WaterFix will not resolve California's ongoing water issues. Rather, it will degrade the Delta environment, ecosystem, and communities.	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.
2013	10	The Town [of Discovery Bay] believes that the proposed California WaterFix and RDEIR/RDEIS are technically and legally inadequate, as they do not comply with the provisions of CEQA, CEQA Guidelines, and NEPA. Reclamation and DWR should prepare and circulate a revised BDCP and accompanying environmental documents that include alternatives that reduce water exports and increase Delta flows for consideration by the public and decision-makers.	The alternatives included in the Draft EIR/EIS, RDEIR/SDEIS, and Final EIR/EIS represent a legally adequate reasonable range of alternatives and the scope of the analysis of alternatives fully complies with both CEQA and NEPA. The Lead Agencies carefully considered all potential alternatives that were proposed during the scoping process and during time of preparation of the EIR/EIS. Although many of the proposed alternatives included meritorious water policy principles, the proposals rejected by the Lead Agencies did not qualify as appropriate alternatives for various reasons. For example, proposals were rejected because they were inconsistent with the project's objectives and purpose and need or included components that are beyond the scope of the project. The text of the Draft EIR/EIS in Chapter 3 (section 3.2) and Appendix 3A to that document thoroughly explain the process used to develop the alternatives, and explain why certain potential alternatives were considered but ultimately rejected by the Lead Agencies. For additional information regarding the formulation and selection of alternatives for evaluation in the EIR/EIS, please see Master Response 4.
2014	1	<p>Since the good Governor will never again seek statewide elective office, he should cease and desist this foolish campaign! Continuing to export scandalous lies and devious propaganda does him no good. Making himself a sop to the mega-millions of GLAD [Greater Los Angeles Desert] voters is meaningless. He needs to take his own advice . . . Shut up!</p> <p>Unless and until the wicked "Water Grab" is torpedoed, the Governor will get his legacy! A vicious, insidious, black hole legacy!</p>	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
2014	2	The BDCP Tunnel is a classic case of the tail wagging the dog! The plan does not allow a single dollar for the conservation of Delta habitat. There is also no improvement in the water supply to the 25 million souls in the GLAD (Greater L.A. Desert) Basin, as promised. The plan contains no funding nor proposals for same. It says the cost will be \$25 billion, but where are these [monies]? The plan has cleverly schemed to allow that "users" will pay. Thus it is not a "tax"! The plan is subtly described as a Department of	DWR acknowledges your opposition to the project. The project would cost approximately \$15 billion to build (not \$25 billion). There would be additional costs for mitigation of approximately \$800 million. The water would be used by the State and Federal water projects that supply drinking water for 25% of Californians, and for agricultural production throughout northern, central, and southern California. Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on the costs of project implementation.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Water "project". The \$25 billion is, itself, a "blue sky" "WAG" (wild-a-- guess). If previous projects are any gauge (the Bay Bridge comes to mind), the cost will be at least \$100 billion!	
2014	3	<p>In addition to the 25 million desert dwellers in GLAD [the Greater Los Angeles Desert], two San Joaquin Valley irrigation districts have tenuously "signed on." But they know that \$25 billion is a political number, and has no connection to real costs!</p> <p>In view of all the above huge flaws, with the plan hierarchy making no attempts to reconcile any of them, all the reviewers must know that the plan is neither a water plan nor a conservation plan, but a politician's statement of scheming and prejudice!</p>	The construction of the water delivery facilities is estimated to cost \$14.9 billion, an amount that would be paid for by the state and federal water contractors who rely on Delta exports. The range of costs for water varies widely among contractors south of the Delta. Costs depend on the source of water, transport facilities, energy requirements, among other factors. For the agricultural customers of the CVP, prices range from \$100 per acre-foot to more than \$400 per acre-foot. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, which buys water from the SWP, estimates that the cost of the proposed project would translate into about \$5.00 extra per household, per month in its service area. The final cost of water from the new conveyance facilities would be determined by numerous factors. A number of these significant factors, such as the project yield and allocation of costs, have yet to be determined. Please see Master Response 5 for more information regarding costs of implementing the proposed project and funding of the proposed project.
2014	4	Finally, wouldn't it be a blessing if all of the "power brokers" could come to grips with logic? If the \$100 billion were spent on several giant saltwater conversion plants on the GLAD [Greater Los Angeles Desert] coast, 25 million desert-dwellers would finally have their self-owned water supply! After 100 years of deceitfully pilfering water owned by others (remember the Owens Valley plundering) Los Angeles Water, aka MWD [Metropolitan Water District], could hold its head high by actually building its own water system! The good Governor could even shut down, dismantle, and donate the monstrous, power-hungry Grapevine pumps to the self-owned GLAD water system!	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
2014	5	<p>"Never have so many been so expertly duped by so few." This paraphrase of Winston Churchill is apt. Nearly one hundred years ago the city fathers of the desert town of Los Angeles determined that to attract Eastern immigrants they needed more water -- lots more! They settled on a plan to swindle water from a mountain river 200 miles to the north, the Owens River watershed by name. The swindle worked. Two hundred miles of canals, ditches, and tubes brought gobs of water to GLAD (Greater Los Angeles Desert) Basin. So much water that the city fathers promised each and every immigrant they could have water for lawns!</p> <p>This con job proved hard to satisfy. When the thousands of immigrants became millions, water ran short. They then (1930's) established [a] monopoly called Los Angeles Water Company [and] schemed to take other states' water from the Colorado River. This worked fine for about one generation. When the other states wanted their water back, Los Angeles Water became desperate. They determined more schemes and dupes were necessary. More schemes and dupes prevailed. Amazingly, L.A. Water, aka MWD [Metropolitan Water District], has, over this span of 100 years, successfully provided its millions of immigrants with other people's water. Not only domestic water, but luxury lawn water! Research tells us that a vast majority of the GLAD citizenry do not know that every drop of their water is owned by others! They also don't know they live in a desert!</p>	<p>In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal and State regulating agencies, ESA compliance, and project design. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).</p>
2014	6	Declare an immediate statewide water emergency. Outlaw the watering of lawns in the entire GLAD [Greater Los Angeles Desert] Basin. This would not be a first. Scores of towns and counties across the desert Southwest have not only banned lawn-watering, but outlawed lawns themselves!	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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).
2014	7	Direct the five counties comprising the GLAD [Greater Los Angeles Desert] Basin to form a coalition for the specific mission to design, fund, and build several saltwater conversion plants along the GLAD Basin coast line. It's a natural! Where else do 25 million desert denizens dwell on the very edge of an ocean? This, again, would not be a first. In 1931 a similar coalition was formed to meet another California challenge. It was called the Golden Gate Bridge! The combined population of those seven counties was less than 1 million!	Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
2014	8	On a schedule and level-of-effort as determined by the coalition, order the gigantic pumps at the bottom of the Grapevine south of Bakersfield to be shut down, disassembled, and transported to sites directed by the coalition. These delivered pumps will be the State's gift contribution to the POW (Pacific Ocean Water) Project.	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.
2014	9	Direct Los Angeles Water to "cease and desist" from further cunning and covert searches for faraway water holes under the domain of faraway owners.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The Proposed Project does not address water transfers that could be considered by SWP and CVP water users, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply, of the EIR/S.
2014	10	Kill the water bond measure now pending before the ballot. It is a known fact that its design and formulation [were] accomplished by shady influence peddlers and shady politicians. It's a loser. It deserves to die!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
2014	11	Order the educational institutions (school districts, cities/towns, colleges, or even the coalition itself), whichever is appropriate, or all of them, to commence a massive educational program for the use and obtainability of water in deserts in general, and the GLAD [Greater Los Angeles Desert] Basin in particular.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
2014	12	The wildcard in the GLAD [Greater Los Angeles Basin]/POW [Pacific Ocean Water] Overhaul Project is, of course, Los Angeles Water. Their position would be critical to the mission's success or failure. It appears likely they would adopt one of the following: 1. Simply take a passive wait-and-see position, and hope it fails, thus securing their continued superpower status. 2. Continue their long-proven practice of "cunning and covert" searching, despite the Governor's order to "cease and desist." Old habits are hard to break. 3. Join the County Coalition's mission. Their great depth in technical skills and resources would ensure the Overhaul Project's success. It would certainly not dilute their super status, but more likely enhance it. One must remember superpower	Comment does not address the merits of the project. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		position was not created by stupid moves.	
2014	13	<p>If the GLAD [Greater Los Angeles Desert]/POW [Pacific Ocean Water] Mission, or something like it, is not undertaken, and soon, three major tragedies will result, the first posed as a question:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can the super-powerful Los Angeles Water monopoly decide the fate of all of California's water? Or is it already a fait accompli? Even Los Angeles Water may not know the answer, but it's most certainly a scary thought! 2. A major chunk of the most prolific and advanced food-producing region of the planet, known as the California Central Valley, will revert to its native state: a desert! 3. The sacred and sensitive estuary formed by the convergence of the Sacramento-San Joaquin River systems, known as the "Delta," will morph into a saltwater swamp! 	<p>The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats.</p> <p>The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well.</p> <p>The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/.</p> <p>The proposed project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports). Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> <p>Impacts to agriculture are identified and discussed in Chapter 14; project proponents have proposed measures that would support and protect agricultural production in the Delta by securing agricultural easements and/or by seeking opportunities to protect and enhance agriculture with a focus on maintaining economic activity on agricultural lands. Please see Master Response 18 for more information on agricultural mitigation.</p>
2015	1	Stop the tunnels!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
2016	1	As both a homeowner and registered voter in San Joaquin County, I'm writing to express my total and complete opposition to the proposed Delta tunnels project.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
2017	1	I vote against the WaterFix project.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
2018	1	Governor Brown's massive groundwater export to tunnels, aka the "California WaterFix," will be devastating to the Delta as well as agriculture and cost billions of dollars for the taxpayers of this state.	<p>Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <p>For more information regarding cost of the proposed project please see Master Response 5.</p>
2019	1	<p>I am a fourth generation resident of San Joaquin County raising the fifth and now sixth generation on our farm in Lodi, California.</p> <p>I am urging and pleading with you not to build the tunnels and devastate the economy of my home and neighbors’.</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), Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place), and Master Response 5 (Cost).</p>
2019	2	<p>Please look to the viable solutions of building more water storage and desalination, among others.</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 7 for information on desalination and why it was not included as a project alternative. Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need. Please see Master Response 37 regarding water storage.</p>
2019	3	<p>We depend on the agency and the Governor to make prudent decisions to help all Californians without destroying the beauty, viability, and livelihood of those living in the Central Valley.</p>	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the Clean Water Act and federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>
2020	1	<p>I am concerned about the twin tunnels. I am writing to ask you not to pass a bill to build them. We don’t have enough water for us, let alone for Southern California. The expense is too great. Surely you can come up with something else to provide water for our state. We will continue to pray for rain [and] conserve as much water as we can.</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.</p> <p>By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California’s water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Please also refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives), Master Response 31 (Delta Reform Act), Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports), Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), and Master Response 35 (MWD Supply).</p>
2021	1	<p>Please stop the building of the twin tunnels. It will devastate the Delta and the economy of my home!</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), Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place), and Master Response 5 (Cost).</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
2022	1	Think about the long-term effects on our environment and our economy. This proposal would devastate our ecology!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the 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>
2022	2	We simply do not have enough water to allow big agriculture [to] grow massive crops in California's desert. It's time to conserve our water use, not divert it irresponsibly.	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Providing regulatory oversight to oil companies or large agribusiness is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34(Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p> <p>The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the proposed project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p>
2023	1	Stop this poor decision. Drawing water out of the river causes harm to the Delta, causes harm to farming in the Delta, and does not provide any new water. The financial investment in this project is a total waste of taxpayers' money -- a better consideration would be to build more dams.	<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. 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. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), and Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding).</p>
2024	1	<p>We are 100% against the controversial tunnel plan for the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta. Not only will the plan destroy the Delta, it will tax the citizens of California with billions of dollars of debt. Economically, it is totally out of scale with the water supply benefits it might provide. California's budget is already very precariously balanced. Though job reports show unemployment is down, these reports do not take into consideration the type of jobs people are working in and the salaries they are being paid. When these facts are looked at, we are not out of the recession. The citizens of California cannot afford to take on billions dollars more debt for a project that destroys parts of Northern California and will not be cost effective in anyway in providing water to Southern California.</p> <p>Please do not allow this project to be proceed. It will destroy the Delta, saddle California citizens with mountains of debt, and will not provide a cost effective solution</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the need for the project and its goals. As described in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, under Alternative 4, Impact ECON-1, construction employment is estimated to peak at 2,427 FTE jobs in year 3. Total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) would peak in year 12, at 8,673 FTE jobs. Direct agricultural employment would be reduced by an estimated 16 FTE jobs, while total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) associated with agricultural employment would fall by 57 FTE jobs. Based on the crop production values changes described in Impact ECON-6 for construction effects, the direct agricultural job losses would more likely be concentrated in the vegetable, truck, orchard, and vineyard crop sectors, which are relatively labor intensive, than in the grain, field, and forage crop sectors, where more jobs are mechanized. For more information regarding funding sources please see Master Response 5.</p> <p>Please note that the proposed project does not serve to fix California's entire water problem. The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		to Southern California's water problem.	reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/ .
2025	1	<p>As citizens of Manteca, we do not approve, nor do we want this plan to go forward! The last several years of scarce water have made us even more doubtful that this would help our farmers and the communities of the Central Valley.</p> <p>Please do not go forward with this plan!</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>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>The project would help to address the resilience and adaptability of the Delta to climate change through water delivery facilities combined with a range of operational flexibility. In addition to the added water management flexibility created by new water diversions and operational scenarios, the project would improve habitat, increase food supplies and reduce the effects of other stressors on the Delta ecosystem.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 34 (Beneficial Uses) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) for additional information.</p>
2026	1	<p>As a resident of San Joaquin County, I would like to take this opportunity to voice my opposition to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix ("Delta Tunnels") proposed project. I am extremely concerned as to how this project will impact the citizens, businesses, and wildlife of the San Joaquin Valley. Under the Governor's plan this project will cause further harm to the unique and fragile Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. It is unbelievable to me that such a proposal is being made when this region has been so severely impacted by the current drought. This project does not provide new water to our region yet it is a plan is to ship the water we do have south.</p>	<p>It is important to note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>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 34 [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 Response 26 (Effects on Northern CA), Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), and</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place) for additional information.
2026	2	Southern California has not placed any restrictions on land development or the giant agribusiness corporations. This harkens back to a similar situation -- when Los Angeles in the 1800s outgrew its water supply. At that point, water was diverted from the Owens Valley to Los Angeles via an aqueduct. Since 1913 the Owens River has been diverted to Los Angeles, causing the ruin of that valley's economy. Los Angeles' water needs continued to grow and in 1941 Los Angeles diverted water that previously fed Mono Lake, north of Owens Valley. The lake's ecosystem for migrating birds was so threatened by dropping water levels that between 1979 and 1994 litigation forced Los Angeles to stop diverting water from around Mono Lake and the lake is starting to rise back to a level which can support its ecosystem.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>
2026	3	<p>The Delta Tunnels Project is simply another grab for our precious resource. We cannot afford to have such a project similarly impact the Delta region. We cannot afford to have it affect the wildlife of the Delta or affect the approximately 4 million people, including 2,500 farmers who contribute \$2 billion to California's economy each year. At an estimated cost of \$15 billion, we deserve a better solution and a more prudent investment to address the state's water supply needs.</p> <p>I sincerely urge you to reconsider and end this proposal.</p>	<p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p>
2027	1	These tunnels will only allow more saltwater intrusion into the Bay. Do not build these water-destroying tunnels.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS.</p>
2028	1	This is not the solution to California's water crisis. Let's demand Big Agriculture take some responsibility for their part in water conservation instead of rewarding them with these tunnels.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The 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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			conveyance facilities.
2029	1	Please protect California's water!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
2030	1	Please maintain the natural flow of the Sacramento River. 35-mile-long tunnels are not an appropriate "fix" for California's 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>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. No response is required.</p>
2031	1	I moved to California in 1978. Voters back then voted down measures to take Delta water for the southern part of the state. This has been an issue that keeps going on and on and has been voted down. Why doesn't the government listen to its voters?	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 36 for information regarding how the proposed project differs from the peripheral canal.</p>
2031	2	The Tunnels do not address the issue that are too many people in California and California is growing. The tunnels would not satisfy the growth. So where would the water come from for all this growth?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. For information on potential growth effects due to project implementation please see Chapter 30 Growth Inducement and Other Indirect Effects, Final EIR/EIS. Also refer to Master Response 6 (Demand Management).
2032	1	The proposed Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP), or the California WaterFix, should not go forward. Diverting water from the Delta of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers has been voted down twice by the people of the State of California. Not only are their environmental issues well-known but many water district managers agree that tunnels are not the solution. Why not listen to them? The pumping of aquifers in the lower San Joaquin Valley has caused subsidence that we do not know the effect of yet. Why take water from the Delta and cause harm that we'll never be able to [repair]?	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility.
2032	2	If Jerry Brown wants to leave a legacy let him lead in solar energy and leave the water in the Delta alone.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
2033	1	It is obvious we have a very delicate ecosystem and it is unfortunate that we are experiencing several years of drought. It is not a challenge at all to see that construction of underground tunnels to divert the Sacramento River around the Delta to the aqueducts to move water does not make water. It does not store water. It only	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>moves existing water. From the ecosystem side of this, the "Delta" loses out based on the lack of fresh water flows through out the already thinly-watered Delta. By this I mean the system is already tasked with numerous users. Removing more fresh water will be a travesty with irreversible affects to our environment so that a few will prosper. We all know who these special interest folks are.</p> <p>I say no tunnels! Just look at what is left from the Colorado River that used to flow to the Sea of Cortez in the Gulf of Mexico. It no longer does.</p>	<p>Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>
2034	1	<p>Do what is right!</p> <p>It does not take a rocket scientist to see that this plan is a complete exercise in futility.</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
2034	2	<p>15 billion dollars in cost? Enough said . . . there is no tangible proof that the tunnels and the water supplied will offset the billions to build.</p>	<p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p>
2034	3	<p>Kill the lifeline of the state's economy -- farming?</p>	<p>This comment does not refer to the adequacy of the environmental document. For more information regarding impacts to agriculture and its associated mitigation measures please see Chapter 14 of the FEIR/EIS.</p>
2034	4	<p>Virtually destroy the habitat and ecosystem that inhabits the 1000s of miles of Delta waterways, and take decades for the saltwater ecosystem to form and become lively?</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>
2034	5	<p>Governor Brown appears to be a smart man. I think his smarts have been muted by his desire to put his name on something that can compete with his father's namesake, the California aqueduct. He will do anything, even if it is a terrible idea, to have his legacy coincide with his father's!</p> <p>Let's build some water repositories and do what is right for the long haul and right for the entire state, not what allows our Governor to see his name next to his father's and for a few large lobbyists with deep pockets in the south!</p> <p>The best way to determine if the tunnels are the right course of action would be not to let the politicians make the call, but rather to present it to the 8th grade students in</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
		the state. That is all the education and smarts one needs to see that this is all around a terrible plan and even worse for the state long-term.	
2035	1	I adamantly oppose the Delta Tunnels. They are bad for our environment, our beautiful Delta and the state's economy. The tunnels are a huge rip-off of our water and of the taxpayers who will fund this huge boondoggle.	<p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <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>
2036	1	It is so disingenuous of Governor Jerry Brown to be going around the world promoting cleaner air and clean energy while promoting the twin tunnels in his home state. Why? The decade of construction building the twin tunnels, 40' in diameter "pipes," will utilize many diesel motors in muck trucks, diesel night lights and pumps. The BDCP proposed using a cap and trade method to get rid of them, but all it does is pay money to a foreign country or city with cleaner air and leave the pollution in the Delta, endangering workers, citizens, and tourists.	As discussed in Chapter 22, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, the mitigation approach for construction activities is first to reduce onsite emissions, followed by the procurement of regional offsets, as applicable. All offsets would be purchased through local air district offset programs or through a DWR-sponsored program (not the California Cap-and-Trade Regulation). With respect to the achieved reductions, all offsets must come from projects located within the same air basin as the generated emissions. Reductions must also be achieved (contracted and delivered) by the applicable year in question (i.e., emissions generated in year 2016 would need to be reduced offsite in 2016). Please see response to comment 219-1.
2036	2	The California "Fix" is a bad, pornographic joke. It does not fix anything. All it has done thus far is waste millions of dollars on consultants. Independent economists have warned the cost will skyrocket far beyond the billions of dollars that Governor Brown's team has admitted. There are better ways to fix California's water problems but we need leaders who don't have tunnel vision backed by Stewart Resnick and his gang who resell California water for big profits.	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.
2037	1	I am very concerned that the proposed tunnels under the Delta will gravely impact the environment of the Delta, decrease the water drinking water quality for consumers who rely on Delta water for municipal supplies, put an infrastructure burden on our children, and cost far more than any benefit it will provide. In short, they undermine the Delta and its benefits as well as our future.	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.
2037	2	The tunnels will make the fresh water bypass the Delta and remove the benefit that water provides to the fish and other aquatic life. The fresh water is essential for keeping the species healthy. Many threatened and endangered species rely on the Delta. The wildlife and aquatic life in the Delta is already struggling due to the drought. When this drought is over, another drought [will] occur. The Delta Tunnels will cause lasting detriment to the environmental water quality.	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.
2037	3	The water quality in the rivers that feed the Delta is already compromised by the extensive farming and municipal use and reuse. The Delta tunnels may not be proposed to send more volume of water to Southern California; however, they will	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the adequacy of the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The potential for water conveyance operations to affect water quality conditions in the Delta (including Suisun Marsh) under existing conditions

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		take water quality away from the Delta. I cannot see how this can be anything but damaging to the environment.	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 RDEIR/SDEIS. Where significant impacts to uses would occur due to the alternative, mitigation to lessen those impacts is provided.
2037	4	In addition to impacting the environment, there are municipalities that take drinking water out of the Delta. The Delta Tunnels will reduce the water quality of the drinking water source those municipalities rely on. The project will "rob Peter to pay Paul" from a water quality standpoint.	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.
2037	5	There will be construction impacts to the Delta as well. As an engineer, it is hard to imagine how constructing two 40'-diameter tunnels under the Delta can be done without any impact to the Delta habitat. I can imagine the physical construction impacts could be enduring. The infrastructure in California is falling apart. Can you imagine the impacts of having to maintain and replace these tunnels in a short 50 to 75 years? What a burden to put on our children!	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Construction-related impacts are disclosed in individual resource area chapters in the EIR/EIS. All impacts would be minimized and mitigated to the degree feasible, as noted under each alternative in the EIR/EIS individual resource chapters and in Appendix 3B (Environmental Commitments) of the EIR/EIS.
2037	6	Lastly, the project will cost billions. "Delta tunnels plan's true price tag: As much as \$67 billion," is what I find in my search for numbers. I do not understand how a project like this could be worth it. If it does somehow gets past the environmental hurdles, it will be my position that only those who benefit from the better water quality should pay for it. I do not want to pay my hard-earned tax dollars for a marginally worth it project that will benefit Southern California.	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. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.
2039	1	Not only is the Delta Tunnels [plan] a boondoggle waiting to happen, it is also an example of state government running roughshod over the people [it was] elected/hired to protect. This is more like a solution looking for a problem to fix and it's a really bad solution at that because it is going to cause a host of other problems. As an example, there is a federal mandate regarding the amount of flow required in the main river feeding the Delta area. If the tunnels take out the projected amount of water, that water remaining in the river has to be supplemented from another source to maintain the mandated flow. Where is that supplemental water going to come from? As far as I know, there isn't any surplus water to fill this mandate from other sources.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641) as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S, subject to adjustments made pursuant to the Proposed Project and adaptive management process. 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.
2039	2	In a time of drought, with communities here in San Joaquin County taking major steps to conserve water and farmers not getting near enough to grow the crops eaten by people all across the U.S., a person has only to drive west on Highway 205/580 over the California Aqueduct to see that the water being transferred to L.A. is more now	Under the range of alternatives considered in the Draft BDCP EIR/EIS, only water under existing water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation could be delivered to SWP and CVP water contractors. The BDCP EIR/EIS evaluates long-term operation of the SWP and CVP over an 82-year long hydrologic period with extended wet periods and dry/critical dry periods. The analyses were not conducted to identify specific values or to

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		than it ever was before. The water level in the aqueduct is at maximum height and has been for months. In years past the water level was never that high in the aqueduct. Why has the amount of water going south increased while conservation is such a big thing here in the north?	respond to short-term emergency situations, such as the ongoing drought. Separate engineering and environmental studies have been and will continue to be prepared when water quality criteria and other regulations are modified in emergencies.
2039	3	This boondoggle project has very little support by citizens and needs to be terminated before more time and money is wasted on it. In its place a group of planners needs to first identify the problem, both near- and long-term, and then find a practical solution for it.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
2040	1	We have followed the BDCP process through its arduous path and its eventual morphing into the so-called "California WaterFix" -- having dropped any pretense of concern for the environment or any focus on intelligent water use with recycling, groundwater recharging, or sustainability. And we feel the time has come when it is necessary for us to speak up, especially against the Delta Tunnels aspect of the plan.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility.
2040	2	Governor Brown's administration has said that "re engineering water flows of the Delta is essential to undoing mistakes of past water projects and to supplying water to Southern California." The truth is that this is just a next generation Peripheral Canal iteration, conveniently boosted by California's current drought. The San Francisco Bay-Delta Estuary -- the largest estuary on the west coast of the Americas -- will be destroyed by this "fix." And Solano's own Suisun Marsh -- the largest brackish marsh on west coast of the United States -- will share in the damage.	A number of important improvements have been made to set the current proposal apart from the Peripheral Canal. For instance, tunnels are proposed to reduce surface impacts associated with canals. The capacity of the Proposed Project is more than 10,000 cfs smaller than the Peripheral Canal. The project as proposed allows for dual conveyance allowing through-Delta operations to continue in order to maintain in-Delta water quality. The Proposed Project would require operation of the proposed new in-Delta portions of the CVP and SWP pursuant to environmentally stringent rules under the Federal Endangered Species Act and California Endangered Species Act.
2040	3	The Delta Tunnels will not provide a single drop of new water. They will not help with our current drought nor with any subsequent water shortages. They will be an environmental disaster with no plus side whatsoever.	It is important to note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project. 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]). 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 26 (Effects on Northern CA) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) for additional information.</p>
2040	4	A fiscal disaster. How many "big dig" projects have ended as total failures? Or how about the new Bay Bridge? Here we're talking about billions of wasted dollars.	Please see Master Response 5 regarding costs of the project.
2040	5	A broad coalition of fishermen, Tribal leaders, family farmers, conservationists, and environmental justice advocates oppose the tunnels, not only because the tunnels would destroy the San Francisco Bay-Delta Estuary, but also because the project would take large areas of Delta farmland -- some of the most fertile land in the country -- out of production in order to export water to corporate agribusiness interests, Southern California water agencies, and oil companies conducting fracking and steam injection operations in the lower parts of the state. Through an eminent domain process. I know that the Solano County Farm Bureau vehemently opposes the tunnel project also.	Please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The adverse impact on farmland resulting from implementing an HCP has been reduced with the selection of Alternative 4A as the preferred alternative. Please see Chapter 14, EIR/EIS for more information on agricultural impacts.
2040	6	More and more people around the entire state have come out against the "WaterFix." It is especially bad for the farmers, the fishing [and] tourism industry, and the environment in the counties surrounding the Delta. Please put a rapid end to the completely flawed "California WaterFix" plan! No Delta Tunnels!	<p>Please see RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, Impact AG-1 and Impact AG-2 and their associated mitigation measures for complete analysis of how the proposed project will effect and mediate important farmland in the Delta.</p> <p>The overall recreation experience for boaters or fishermen in the vicinity of intake construction areas would be reduced during construction activities because of the elevated noise levels as well as visual setting disruptions. These temporary construction-related effects would last for up to 5 years in the vicinity of intake and barge unloading facilities and could alter fish populations such that recreational fishing opportunities in the study area would be affected. Weekday construction would reduce the amount of fish and other wildlife in recreation areas in the vicinity of the intakes, resulting in decreased recreation opportunities related to wildlife and fish, causing recreationists to experience a changed recreation setting. Chapter 15 describes potential impacts on on-water recreation and fishing. Mitigation Measures would reduce impacts on marine navigation by developing and implementing site-specific construction traffic management plans; installing visual barriers between construction work areas and sensitive receptors; applying aesthetic design treatments to all structures; and employing noise-reducing construction practices. The potential impact on covered and non-covered sport fish species from construction activities would be considered less than significant because the proposed project would include environmental commitments (Appendix 3B). Mitigation Measures would also be available to reduce construction-related underwater noise and pile driving effects, to initiate a complaint/response program, and to provide alternative bank fishing access sites. Please see Chapter 16 Socioeconomics of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP for additional information regarding economic impacts to marinas.</p>
2041	1	We have followed the BDCP process through its arduous path and its eventual morphing into the so-called "California WaterFix" -- having dropped any pretense of concern for the environment or any focus on intelligent water use with recycling, groundwater recharging, or sustainability. And we feel the time has come when it is necessary for us to speak up, especially against the Delta Tunnels aspect of the plan.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility.
2041	2	Governor Brown's administration has said that "re engineering water flows of the Delta	A number of important improvements have been made to set the current proposal apart from the

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>is essential to undoing mistakes of past water projects and to supplying water to Southern California."</p> <p>The truth is that this is just a next generation Peripheral Canal iteration, conveniently boosted by California's current drought. The San Francisco Bay-Delta Estuary -- the largest estuary on the west coast of the Americas -- will be destroyed by this "fix." And Solano's own Suisun Marsh -- the largest brackish marsh on west coast of the United States -- will share in the damage.</p>	<p>Peripheral Canal. For instance, tunnels are proposed to reduce surface impacts associated with canals. The capacity of the Proposed Project is more than 10,000 cfs smaller than the Peripheral Canal. The project as proposed allows for dual conveyance allowing through-Delta operations to continue in order to maintain in-Delta water quality. The Proposed Project would require operation of the proposed new in-Delta portions of the CVP and SWP pursuant to environmentally stringent rules under the Federal Endangered Species Act and California Endangered Species Act.</p>
2041	3	<p>The Delta Tunnels will not provide a single drop of new water. They will not help with our current drought nor with any subsequent water shortages. They will be an environmental disaster with no plus side whatsoever.</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> <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 Response 6 (Purpose and Need) for additional information.</p>
2041	4	<p>A fiscal disaster. How many "big dig" projects have ended as total failures? Or how about the new Bay Bridge? Here we're talking about billions of wasted dollars.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 5 regarding costs of the project.</p>
2041	5	<p>A broad coalition of fishermen, Tribal leaders, family farmers, conservationists, and environmental justice advocates oppose the tunnels, not only because the tunnels would destroy the San Francisco Bay-Delta Estuary, but also because the project would take large areas of Delta farmland -- some of the most fertile land in the country -- out of production in order to export water to corporate agribusiness interests, Southern California water agencies, and oil companies conducting fracking and steam injection operations in the lower parts of the state. Through an eminent domain process. I know that the Solano County Farm Bureau vehemently opposes the tunnel project also.</p>	<p>Please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The adverse impact on farmland resulting from implementing an HCP has been reduced with the selection of Alternative 4A as the preferred alternative. Please see Chapter 14, EIR/EIS for more information on agricultural impacts.</p>
2041	6	<p>More and more people around the entire state have come out against the "WaterFix." It is especially bad for the farmers, the fishing [and] tourism industry, and the environment in the counties surrounding the Delta. Please put a rapid end to the</p>	<p>Please see RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, Impact AG-1 and Impact AG-2 and their associated mitigation measures for complete analysis of how the proposed project will effect and</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		completely flawed "California WaterFix" plan! No Delta Tunnels!	<p>mediate important farmland in the Delta.</p> <p>The overall recreation experience for boaters or fishermen in the vicinity of intake construction areas would be reduced during construction activities because of the elevated noise levels as well as visual setting disruptions. These temporary construction-related effects would last for up to 5 years in the vicinity of intake and barge unloading facilities and could alter fish populations such that recreational fishing opportunities in the study area would be affected. Weekday construction would reduce the amount of fish and other wildlife in recreation areas in the vicinity of the intakes, resulting in decreased recreation opportunities related to wildlife and fish, causing recreationists to experience a changed recreation setting. Chapter 15 describes potential impacts on on-water recreation and fishing. Mitigation Measures would reduce impacts on marine navigation by developing and implementing site-specific construction traffic management plans; installing visual barriers between construction work areas and sensitive receptors; applying aesthetic design treatments to all structures; and employing noise-reducing construction practices. The potential impact on covered and non-covered sport fish species from construction activities would be considered less than significant because the proposed project would include environmental commitments (Appendix 3B). Mitigation Measures would also be available to reduce construction-related underwater noise and pile driving effects, to initiate a complaint/response program, and to provide alternative bank fishing access sites. Please see Chapter 16 Socioeconomics of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP for additional information regarding economic impacts to marinas.</p>
2042	1	I have lived my whole life around the Delta in Solano County. And I want to speak up and oppose the "California WaterFix."	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
2042	2	The San Francisco Bay-Delta Estuary -- the largest estuary on the west coast of the Americas -- will be destroyed by this "fix." The Delta Tunnels will not provide a single drop of new water. They will not help with our current drought nor with any subsequent water shortages. They will be an environmental disaster.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Water delivered to the SWP and CVP water contractors participating in proposed project would be within the existing contract amounts to serve agricultural lands that have been cultivated and existing and planned community populations. As described in Chapter 5, Water Supply, of the EIR/S, it is anticipated that climate change would result in more frequent and more severe rainfall events and less snowfall than under historic conditions. These rainfall events would result in periods of time when the capacity of the existing intakes would not be adequate. Therefore, the proposed project would provide the maximum capacity in the intakes and tunnels during those periods of time to convey water during extremely wet periods to areas south of the Delta for storage and use during drier times. The proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase flows in the wet winter months when the river flows are high to improve conditions for aquatic resources. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries in drier periods. The north Delta and south Delta intakes would only be used to divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements.</p> <p>The SWP and CVP operations under the action alternatives would only deliver water under existing water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board to DWR and Reclamation for use by the SWP and CVP with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The range of alternatives in the EIR/EIS includes alternatives which result in reductions in SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta as compared to the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative and Alternatives 4H1, 4H2, 4H3, 4H4; 5; 6A, 6B, 6C; 7; 8; and 9 would result in less SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta than under Existing Conditions (shown in Tables 5-5 and 5-8). Similarly, Alternatives 6A, 6B, 6C; 7; 8; and 9 would result in less SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta than under the No Action Alternative (shown in Tables 5-6 and 5-9). However, SWP and CVP water deliveries would continue under all alternatives.</p> <p>The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).
2042	3	A broad coalition of fishermen, Tribal leaders, family farmers, conservationists, and environmental justice advocates oppose the tunnels, not only because the tunnels would destroy the San Francisco Bay Delta Estuary, but also because the project would take large areas of Delta farmland -- some of the most fertile land in the country -- out of production in order to export water to corporate agribusiness interests, Southern California water agencies, and oil companies conducting fracking and steam injection operations in the southern parts of the state.	Please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The adverse impact on farmland resulting from implementing an HCP has been reduced with the selection of Alternative 4A as the preferred alternative. Please see Chapter 14, EIR/EIS for more information on agricultural impacts.
2042	4	This is not a "WaterFix." What we need is intelligent water use that includes recycling, groundwater recharging, and sustainability.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management.
2043	1	As someone who has used many of the waterways that will be affected by this plan, I am appalled that the governor and government care more about Southern California than Northern/Central California with its agriculture that feeds not only California, but the world. I am appalled that waterways and recreation areas that are the basis for economic conditions, will put an enormous burden on the people who rely on the recreation these waterways provide, along with the many towns [and] surrounding areas. Our children grew up enjoying this part of Northern/Central California and I want my grandchildren to be able to also, but that will not happen if this ridiculous idea of water tunnels comes to be.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the 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 overall recreation experience for boaters or fishermen in the vicinity of intake construction areas would be reduced during construction activities because of the elevated noise levels as well as visual setting disruptions. These temporary construction-related effects would last for up to 5 years in the vicinity of intake and barge unloading facilities and could alter fish populations such that recreational fishing opportunities in the study area would be affected. Weekday construction would reduce the amount of fish and other wildlife in recreation areas in the vicinity of the intakes, resulting in decreased recreation opportunities related to wildlife and fish, causing recreationists to experience a changed recreation setting. Chapter 15 describes potential impacts on on-water recreation and fishing. Mitigation Measures would reduce impacts on marine navigation by developing and implementing site-specific construction traffic management plans; installing visual barriers between construction work areas and sensitive receptors; applying aesthetic design treatments to all structures; and employing noise-reducing construction practices. The potential impact on covered and non-covered sport fish species from construction activities would be considered less than significant because the proposed project would include environmental commitments (Appendix 3B). Mitigation Measures would also be available to reduce construction-related underwater noise and pile driving effects, to initiate a complaint/response program, and to provide alternative bank fishing access sites. Please see Chapter 16 Socioeconomics of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP for additional information regarding economic impacts to marinas.</p>
2045	1	I oppose the construction of the proposed "WaterFix" tunnels. If Southern California needs water, let them build desalination plants. It makes no sense to disrupt the sensitive environment of our native species in our waterways. The Delta has been in place for hundreds of years and the tunnels will change the Delta as we know it today and not for the good! Please stop the tunnels and save the Delta.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
2046	1	I am against this project as it will destroy not only fishing but Delta farmland. One of the biggest [sources of] income for the state is farming.	Please see RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, Impact AG-1 and Impact AG-2 and their associated mitigation measures for complete analysis of how the proposed project will effect and mediate important farmland in the Delta.
2046	2	A better way to get more water to the south is to build desalting plants in Southern California.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
2047	1	Please . . . do not destroy our Northern California beautiful Delta.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. 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>
2048	1	Just another turn of the screws on California's already overtaxed taxpayers.	Please see Master Response 5 regarding costs of the project.
2048	2	Do you not think it's about time we stop sending any water anywhere we do not have? The waste of land and resources to build something we do not need. As we have been in danger of salt water invading Stockton's groundwater for years your solution is to send more to Southern California?	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Water delivered to the SWP and CVP water contractors participating in proposed project would be within the existing contract amounts to serve agricultural lands that have been cultivated and existing and planned community populations, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply. The proposed project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply.</p> <p>The EIR/S modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.</p>
2048	3	We have no guarantee we will even get enough water for the needs for food grown here. I am just a little tired of this state's oversized government planners with their heads up who knows where. I am tired of food shipped from countries where human waste is used for fertilizer. It's bad enough, the lies to the public about GMOs being safe.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. Senior water rights holders are not affected by implementation of action alternatives. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation would be able to pump from the proposed north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the proposed project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S.
2049	1	Nobody mentions if the current Tracy pumps will continue to pump water or not if the tunnels were to be built. That leads me to only one conclusion; the south wants even	As described in Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives, of the EIR/EIS, the Jones Pumping Plant (previously known as the Tracy Pumping Plant) will continue to divert water for the CVP and the Banks Pumping Plant will continue to divert water for the SWP. Water will be diverted from both the north Delta and south Delta

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		more of the north's water than they are currently getting.	intakes and conveyed to these pumping plants for continued conveyance to municipal and agricultural SWP and CVP water users. As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Resources Control Board for the SWP and CVP operations with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.
2049	2	The water transfer proposal flaunts the improvements that this project will have for the Delta. Who in their right mind would conclude that by taking millions, if not billions, [of] gallons of water "away" from the Delta that it would improve the Delta in any way? The Delta was created by the flow of water through it in the first place. We keep taking more [and] more water away from it in the name of improving it. There is a limit to how much we can divert and we've already gone past that point. Saltwater incursion is happening now to the point we have to build dams to keep it out.	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.
2049	3	If your memory serves you, you'll remember the failed attempts in the past to "move more water south." The voters struck it down several times/ways; now the Governor has taken the route to entirely cut the voters out of the decision-making process. With more political weight [and] money in the south, where does that leave us up here in the north?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
2049	4	The south needs to come up with some other solution to getting more water than taking it from the north. How about desalination plants? Saudi Arabia does it as do several other countries. Doubt the cost would be any more than this "Twin Tunnel" nightmare.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
2049	5	If you haven't already come to the conclusion that I'm against this entire project, I'll say it again: "I'm against this entire twin tunnel project from start to finish," as are many professionals in the field.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
2050	1	I should like to add my thoughts in opposition to the plan to divert the Sacramento River into a tunnel project. This would cause a total disruption to a large area and cause chaos to many people affected by this plan. One more year of drought and there may not be enough water to enter the proposed tunnels.	The operating plan establishes when and how much water can be diverted in the different water year types. In dry years, there is less water diverted than in wet years. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
2050	2	I keep hearing about building more storage reservoirs, but see no action in this direction. I suggest that there may be better ways to resolve our water crisis. Being a coastal state, we live next door to the world's largest ocean and the water is free. Most of our ships and many foreign counties rely on desalination and use converted seawater as there is very little other. Building desalination plants would be a long-lasting solution. Desalination plants could be powered by Pebble Bed Nuclear Reactors which are absolutely safe [and] also long-lasting. Read "Physics for Future Presidents" by Berkeley professor Richard A. Muller for a description of pebble-bed reactors. I offer this thought as a possible faster, cheaper, and, in my opinion, a more permanent solution	Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives (such as desalination) that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project. However, nothing in the proposed project would prevent other entities from pursuing innovative approaches to desalination or other water supply solutions. As described in Appendix 3A, Section 3A.7, Results of Initial Screening of Conveyance Alternatives, EIR/EIS (2013), desalination was included as part of Alternative B7. Issues related to desalination include land use impacts, costs, and substantial energy use requirements. Advances in technology have improved feasibility of desalination and as a statewide water use planning component; it will be evaluated by water agencies on a local/regional level. Desalination, the process of removing salt and other minerals from seawater to make it suitable for drinking

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		to our present and growing need for water.	<p>or irrigation, is being implemented in several California communities. However, it has not proven viable to secure adequate water supplies to meet California's needs due to high costs and energy demands.</p> <p>Today, desalination creates an estimated 84,000 acre-feet of potable water a year in the state, mostly through treatment of brackish groundwater, which is less salty and cheaper to treat than sea water. In comparison, the proposed project would secure an estimated 4.7 to 5.2 million acre-feet of water to supply more than 25 million people and 3 million acres of farmland.</p> <p>Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Local water agencies will need to invest in additional strategies and technologies, including desalination, to meet future water demand.</p> <p>The proposed project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies needed to meet California's overall water management needs. It is not a substitute for increased commitments to other water supply solutions, including recycling, desalination, water conservation and storage.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding desalination.</p>
2051	1	I see no reason to route water around the Delta, especially with large concrete tunnels. Why? Leave things alone.	<p>For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
2051	2	If you want to do something for "more water," consider a huge water desalination [plant] at Antioch. Removing the salt from seawater would give us more water.	Please see Master Response 7 for a discussion on desalination.
2052	1	We oppose the tunnels project. It will be a financial hardship for the unique and fragile San Joaquin Delta 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 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 (Cost).
2053	1	I am against the Delta tunnels! We went to L.A. recently and they didn't even know we were in a drought. Water running down the street, everything green! Not like Manteca where it's all brown and dried up. No more water to [the] south! No twin tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply) and Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
2053	2	[ATT1: Flier reading "The Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix ('Delta Tunnels') public comment period is ending on October 30!" with "No" hand-written on it]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in the comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
2054	1	Stop the tunnels. Invest in the future. Build more dams.	Please see Master Response 37 regarding water storage.
2055	1	I write this letter to express my opposition to the twin tunnels proposed by Governor Brown. To me this proposed project is nothing more than a water grab by the agribusiness corporations of the south. It will not contribute to the health of the Delta and in fact it will destroy the Delta as we know it. Governor Brown has already reneged on part of the environmental plan for this project. We have seen how the south has sapped their sources of water through excess use and lack of conservation. Agribusiness may poison the ground as the selenium builds in their fields through the	<p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		rapid evaporation of water on desert land.	<p>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 45 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <p>Selenium is an essential trace element for human and other animal nutrition that occurs naturally in the environment. The State Water Board lists the western Delta as having impaired water quality for selenium (under Section 303[d]). The Central Valley Water Board completed a TMDL for selenium in the lower San Joaquin River (downstream of the Merced River) in 2001 and Salt Slough in 1997/1999, and USEPA approved this in 2002. The San Francisco Bay Water Board is conducting a TMDL project to address selenium toxicity in the North San Francisco Bay (North Bay), defined to include a portion of the Delta, Suisun Bay, Carquinez Strait, San Pablo Bay, and the Central Bay. The North Bay selenium TMDL will identify and characterize selenium sources to the North Bay and the processes that control the uptake of selenium by wildlife. The TMDL will quantify selenium loads, develop and assign waste load and load allocations among sources, and include an implementation plan designed to achieve the TMDL and protect beneficial uses. Alternative 4A would result in small changes in average selenium concentrations in water relative to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative (ELT) at all modeled Delta assessment locations. Relative to Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative (ELT), operations of the water conveyance facilities under Alternative 4A would result in essentially no change in selenium concentrations throughout the Delta for most biota (about 1% or less), although larger increases in selenium concentrations are predicted for sturgeon in the western Delta. Concentrations of selenium in sturgeon would exceed only the lower benchmark, indicating a low potential for effects. At the Banks and Jones pumping plants, Alternative 4A would cause no increases in the frequency with which applicable benchmarks would be exceeded and would slightly improve the quality of water in selenium concentrations. Environmental Commitments 3, 4, 6–12, 15, and 16 would not increase selenium loading, and the amount of restoration that would occur would be minimal relative to the area of the Delta and implemented such that any localized changes in residence time are unlikely to measurably change selenium concentrations in water or biota relative to Existing Conditions or the No Action Alternative. With implementation of Environmental Commitments 3, 4, 6–12, 15, and 16, it is unlikely that substantial increases in selenium in fish tissues or bird eggs would occur such that effects on aquatic life beneficial uses would be anticipated, and because of the avoidance and minimization measures that are designed to further minimize and evaluate the risk of such increases (see BDCP Appendix 3.C, Avoidance and Minimization Measures, for more detail on AMM27) as well as the Selenium Management environmental commitment (see Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs).</p>
2055	2	Has the governor that expresses such great concern for the environment, or anyone else, really given thought to the carbon footprint that will be left by this project? What happens if our climate is completely changed by global warming and we have little snow in the northern Sierra and floods in Southern California? The devil is in the details and this plan has lots verbiage but lacks details. A recent report by a group of scientist states that the massive tunnel-planning document is "incomplete and opaque."	<p>The anticipated hydrologic changes due to climate change (increased temperatures and more years of critical dryness, increased water temperatures, changes in precipitation and runoff patterns, sea level rise, and tidal variations) will constrain and challenge future water management practices across the state, with or without the proposed project. The state is addressing climate change through strategies and a decision-making framework as outlined in the California Climate Adaptation Strategy and Adaptation Planning Guide. However, no single project and indeed none of the project alternatives would be able to completely counteract all of the impacts of climate change.</p> <p>The State of California has acknowledged that sea level rise threatens coastal and near coastal resources (such as the Delta and Delta water supplies) and that adaptation and resiliency planning to protect these resources from expected levels of sea level rise is appropriate. (OPC, 2013) http://www.opc.ca.gov/2013/04/update-to-the-sea-level-rise-guidance-document/</p> <p>(CCC, 2013) http://www.coastal.ca.gov/climate/SLRguidance.html</p> <p>EO S-3-05. http://gov.ca.gov/news.php?id=1861</p> <p>EO S-13-08 http://gov.ca.gov/news.php?id=11036</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>AB 32 also mentions SLR as a threat to California.</p> <p>California Waterfix would help to address the resilience and adaptability of the Delta to climate change through water delivery facilities combined with a range of operational scenarios, measures focused on the protection, restoration, and enhancement of the Delta ecosystem and measures to reduce other stressors (Environmental Commitments 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16. In addition to the added water management flexibility created by new water diversions and operational scenarios, California Waterfix would improve habitat, increase food supplies and reduce the effects of other stressors on the Delta ecosystem. By improving and expanding available habitat, the proposed project would increase resilience and adaptability to climate change by making alternative habitat available during periods of high stress, such as very high or low freshwater inflow or very high salinity intrusion.</p> <p>Multiple analyses were performed in the proposed project to test the robustness of the alternatives to a range of potential future conditions. Water supply, aquatic and terrestrial resources were all analyzed with projected future conditions. The proposed project will likely remain in place and functional far into the future when salinity intrusion may require less frequent use of the south Delta pumps. Far from being stranded assets, the tunnels will be part of the state's strategy in adapting to climate change.</p> <p>More information on ways in which the BDCP/California WaterFix proposes to improve resiliency and adaptability of the Delta to climate change can be found in Chapter 29, Climate Change, EIR/EIS and Appendix A RDEIR/SDEIS and Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS (in appendix A).</p>
2055	3	What about the debt incurred by this project? We know the cost will be far greater than the estimates indicate and taxpayers will ultimately pay for the extra costs. If the project is completed as planned, the northern part of the state will be asked to live in perpetual drought while the south guzzles water. The economy of cities like Stockton will fail and the environmental consequence of the tunnels will be devastating. You will not build those tunnels and destroy the economy and the environment of my home! Reject the tunnels.	Please see Master Response 5 regarding costs of implementation and funding for the BDCP. 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.
2056	1	I am totally opposed to the Twin Tunnel Project. It focuses on conveyance rather than conservation and recycling. It will destroy the Delta despite its claims to restore the waterway. Promises by the California Natural Resources Agency to make adjustments to the plan only demonstrate a determination to go ahead with building the tunnels.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
2056	2	San Diego is desalinating water. Orange County is recycling water. Why does the state have to spend billions when alternatives can and do work? And just try recapturing that money from the users such as the Westlands Water District.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
2056	3	Scientific studies have revealed the pitfalls of the plan. The most recent one by the Delta Independent Science Board raises significant questions about adaptive management, lack of enough details regarding climate change, sea level rise, levee failures and water delivery, and providing a readable report that helps people understand its contents.	For responses to comments related to the Delta Independent Science Board's letters, please refer to comment letters BDCP 1448 and/or RECIRC 2546. Regarding adaptive management, please also refer to Master Response 33.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
2056	4	A project undertaken by the Delta Protection Commission produced scholarly essays about the history of the estuary, emphasizing its importance as "a place." The Delta has great historical significance that as a former Bay Area resident I was totally unaware of until I moved here. I do not think the tunnels would even be a consideration if people understood that [the Delta] deserves designation as a National Heritage Area.	Cultural landscapes (such as the Delta) are discussed throughout Chapter 18, including Rural Historic Landscapes in the Delta (Section 18.1.7.8). Direct effects of these cultural landscapes are discussed in Section 18.3.2 and Mitigation Measure CUL-6 includes following the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 CFR 68) and the National Park Service's Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes.
2056	5	Water is our most precious natural resource. Let's implement plans that are a win-win for all Californians.	<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. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).</p>
2057	1	It seems to me that too much money will be spent on the water intake tubes proposed by the Governor's office.	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.
2057	2	If the delta levees are in danger, why not spend the money on improving them instead of the potential of taking more water out of the Delta than is now allowed? Disregarding that the potential that the sea level will rise 3 feet or more in the future can be a problem, of course, what happens when severe runoff happens? Does that mean more water goes south to avoid levee damage?	<p>Please see Chapter 2, FEIR/EIS, for the BDCP/CWF purpose and need, and Appendix 6A Sections 6A.2 and 6A.3 for discussion on existing levee improvement programs and funding mechanisms, which would not be affected by the BDCP/CWF. Levees are an important public safety resource and the proposed project would not change levee policy or replace ongoing programs and grant projects aimed at facilitating and supporting levee improvements in or outside the Delta. It recognized that levee maintenance and safety in the Delta is an important issue for the residents of the Delta and for statewide interests.</p> <p>In addition, the proposed project would restore and protect the ability of the SWP and CVP to deliver up to full contract amounts, when hydrologic conditions result in the availability of sufficient water, consistent with the requirements of state and federal law and the terms and conditions of water delivery contracts and other existing applicable agreements. The project will be required to comply with regulatory agency standards and conditions on SWP and CVP water export operations under any scenario.</p>
2057	3	It is inconceivable to me that all the arguments for the project do not do one thing to increase the supply of water, except maybe to Southern California and some farmers, when the direction of Department of Water Resources should be concentrating on increasing the ability to store more water for dry years.	Please see Master Response 37 regarding water storage.
2057	4	Water conservation seems to be gone in any thinking about our water system. The farmers on the west side should not been allowed to plant water-thirsty crops in an arid area that needs much more water than is required by the more established farms.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). The proposed project would not increase the amount of water to which SWP and CVP hold water rights for use allowed under their contracts and permits and approvals for refuge water supplies or other environmental purposes.</p>
2057	5	<p>I believe that this is a political move on the part of Governor Jerry Brown, to satisfy his Southern California friends [and] influential farmers and leave a legacy of being the Water Rights Champion --all to be a burden on the backs of the taxpayers. It's a boondoggle, too expensive, too full of holes in the wording on how it will work and too disruptive to the Delta.</p>	<p>Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>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>
2057	6	<p>All Californians will pay for it, but I cannot see where Northern California would benefit from water diversion around the Delta. Please cancel the 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. (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 Response 26 (Effects on Northern California) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) for additional information.</p>
2059	1	<p>Our State leaders have once again failed. There has not been one significant water storage project in California in the last 30 years. Yet the population has grown over 30% in that time frame. So what is the brilliant plan -- tunnels? So instead of spending the taxpayers' money on much-needed water storage, we are going to divert water from the farmers who feed the 40 million residents of California, disrupt Delta farming operations that have been there for generations and [cause] who knows what havoc to the Delta's ecosystem as a result.</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
2059	2	These tunnels are more than a bad plan. It is on par with the Governor's bullet train pork project -- another colossal waste of taxpayers' money.	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.
2061	1	I'm very opposed to the Delta tunnels project for the following reason: Cost of construction, administration, operation, anticipated cost-overruns, etc. will be immense, far more than what is projected now. Some predict \$60 billion or even more.	DWR acknowledges your opposition to the project. The project would cost approximately \$15 billion to build. There would be additional costs for mitigation of approximately \$800 million. The water would be used by the State and Federal water projects that supply drinking water for 25% of Californians, and for agricultural production throughout northern, central, and southern California. Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on the estimated costs.
2061	2	I'm very opposed to the Delta tunnels project for the following reason: The plan creates no new water. Investing in conservation, recycling, and storage of water would be more efficient and less costly.	Please see Master Response 37 regarding water storage. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. Although conservation components and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including storm water drainage. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3. For more information regarding cost please see Master Response 5.
2061	3	I'm very opposed to the Delta tunnels project for the following reason: Fixing the levees would cost much, much less and is more important for water security than the tunnels.	Please see Chapter 2, FEIR/EIS, for the BDCP/CWF purpose and need, and Appendix 6A Sections 6A.2 and 6A.3 for discussion on existing levee improvement programs and funding mechanisms, which would not be affected by the BDCP/CWF. Levees are an important public safety resource and the proposed project would not change levee policy or replace ongoing programs and grant projects aimed at facilitating and supporting levee improvements in or outside the Delta. It recognized that levee maintenance and safety in the Delta is an important issue for the residents of the Delta and for statewide interests.
2061	4	I'm very opposed to the Delta tunnels project for the following reason: We have already been taking more fresh water from the Delta than is sustainable according to state and federal fishery agencies. Species such as salmon, smelt, and sturgeon need fresh water to survive. Taking even more fresh water from the Delta would endanger these and many other species. San Francisco Bay needs fresh water for its fishing, tourism, and restaurant industries.	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.
2061	5	I'm very opposed to the Delta tunnels project for the following reason: I'm in the Santa Clara Valley Water District; our rates will go up, but we won't get more water since no new water will be created.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
2061	6	An important question: Will the state conduct a full cost-benefit analysis of the project, including the value of fresh water to the San Francisco Bay-Delta Estuary?	DWR is revising the Socioeconomic Impact Analysis for the project based on changes included in the Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS. Please also refer to Master Response 5 regarding costs of implementation, and 39 for more information regarding funding for the BDCP. Note that an assessment of water quality effects of the alternatives on San Francisco Bay beneficial uses is provided in Impact WQ-34 in Chapter 8, Water Quality for all alternatives. Alternative 4A would have a less than significant impact to San

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Francisco Bay water quality.
2062	1	Stop the tunnels. As said by others, use the funds to build desalination plants to provide water to Southern California. Enforce water conservation in Palm Springs, Palm Desert, etc.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
2063	1	While I understand and support the need to fix the Delta ecosystem declines and improve water export reliability, the Delta tunnels "California WaterFix" plan ultimately seems like a mistake because of cost-benefit problems if, as promised, there will be less water moved out of the Delta except during times of "big gulp" wet years, and because the ecosystem declines almost certainly require more water to move through the Delta in its traditional pattern.	<p>Please see the BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report (http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/Draft_BDCP_Statewide_Economic_Impact_Report_8-5-13.sflb.ashx), which indicates that the BDCP would result in a substantial net economic benefit to the State of California. An updated cost/benefit analysis is currently being conducted for the current preferred Alternative, 4A.</p> <p>The project's proposed dual conveyance facilities would allow water to be moved through the Delta when conditions permit, and allow water to be diverted from the Sacramento River in the northern Delta when conditions in the south Delta do not permit diversions from the existing State Water Project and Central Valley Project facilities. The location of the north Delta diversion facility is less vulnerable to salinity intrusion, a potential impact of sea level rise, or levee failure, in the future. By establishing an alternative diversion point for exports, a great deal of water management flexibility is added. This added flexibility would provide more options for adaptively managing the Delta so that conditions can be optimized to provide the greatest benefits across all Delta water uses and habitat conditions.</p>
2063	2	<p>The west Delta option that has been suggested by a number of organizations and by the former Delta watermaster makes so much more sense, because it keeps the water flowing through the estuary up to the salinity mixing zone and requires a much shorter and cheaper tunnel beginning at Sheridan Island. I understand that putting the intake so close to the critical zone for smelt is a key objection, but on balance, the impacts to the entire estuary and possible means available to decrease the take of smelt at the intake compare favorably with the existing intake challenges (which will not go away because the existing pumps will continue to be used).</p> <p>So I ask that a west Delta tunnel option be seriously analyzed before DWR moves further ahead on this project.</p>	<p>15 alternatives and 3 new subalternatives were analyzed in the EIR/S and the RDEIR/RSEIS respectively. Four major alignments have been included in the EIR/S: Through-Delta, East of the Sacramento River, West of the Sacramento River, and a Tunnel under the Delta. Many additional proposals by public and private individuals and organizations have also been evaluated and described in Chapter 3 of the EIR/S and Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1.</p> <p>Regarding development of alternatives for the EIR/EIS, a description of the process the Lead Agencies followed to develop and screen alternatives is provided in Master Response 4.</p>
2064	1	I am in direct opposition of [the] tunnels being built or used. I believe this project is costly and dangerous. The Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta would be caused harm.	<p>For more information regarding cost of the proposed project please see Master Response 5.</p> <p>Please see the BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report (http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/Draft_BDCP_Statewide_Economic_Impact_Report_8-5-13.sflb.ashx), which indicates that the BDCP would result in a substantial net economic benefit to the State of California. An updated cost/benefit analysis is currently being conducted for the current preferred Alternative, 4A.</p>
2064	2	No new water is being addressed, but instead only transferring of water thereby damaging the Delta community's, as well as California's, economy produced in this area.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Water delivered to the SWP and CVP water contractors participating in proposed project would be within the existing contract amounts to serve agricultural lands that have been cultivated and existing and planned community populations. As described in Chapter 5, Water Supply, of the EIR/S, it is anticipated that climate change would result in more frequent and more severe rainfall events and less snowfall than under historic conditions. These rainfall events would result in periods of time when the capacity of the existing intakes would not be adequate. Therefore, the proposed project would provide the maximum capacity in the intakes and tunnels during those periods of time to convey water during extremely wet periods to areas south of the Delta for storage and use during drier times. The proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase flows in the wet winter months when the river flows are high to improve

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>conditions for aquatic resources. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries in drier periods. The north Delta and south Delta intakes would only be used to divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements.</p> <p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.</p>
2065	1	<p>I want to go on record as opposing the Governor Brown so-called "WaterFix." These tunnels that are supposed to be an answer to the shortage of water in Central Valley and Southern California are nothing more than an end run to the legal process. Solutions are needed for the problem we have in California but should not be at the expense of Delta users and Delta area property owners -- to say nothing of the degradation of our wildlife resources -- nor should it create a greater water shortage in the Delta than exists in Central Valley.</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>
2065	2	<p>Come on, guys! Play the game above the belt and find "real" solutions that are legal and transparent to the public. I join the cry of foul of others in the Delta area. You know that you are catering to the big money water-grabbers to the detriment of our precious natural resource, the Delta surrounding communities and the necessary continued flow of water through the Delta. Stop playing games and find real solutions! Stop the tunnels now!</p>	<p>The fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta and water supplies of the SWP and CVP for users located south of the Delta; make Delta water quality consistent with statutory and contractual obligations of the SWP and CVP; and improve portions of the Delta ecosystem, as described in Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need, of the EIR/EIS. Operation of the BDCP water delivery system and SWP and CVP facilities would be in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The BDCP only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including stream flows and water quality which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, needs of other beneficial uses (including the environmental habitat), the presence of threatened and endangered species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of BDCP water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives, in the EIR/EIS.</p>
2066	1	<p>For years, the Delta has been misused; pulling more water from the flow will just damage it further. Ecological stability is being compromised daily from the drought and reducing flow will not help. The fact that the federal government called the plan a disaster should be a clue that the two tunnels are not a viable option to help our situations in both the Delta area as well as the south.</p> <p>When we ruin our environment, we ruin the potential to thrive. As a Realtor® and a homeowner, the two tunnels will create more problems that will have far-reaching</p>	<p>The fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta and water supplies of the SWP and CVP for users located south of the Delta; make Delta water quality consistent with statutory and contractual obligations of the SWP and CVP; and improve portions of the Delta ecosystem, as described in Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need, of the EIR/EIS. Operation of the BDCP water delivery system and SWP and CVP facilities would be in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The BDCP only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including stream flows and water quality which would be determined</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		effects. Do not go forward with this plan!	based upon how much water is actually available in the system, needs of other beneficial uses (including the environmental habitat), the presence of threatened and endangered species, and water quality standards.
2067	1	No tunnels. Too expensive and harmful.	For more information regarding cost of the proposed project please see Master Response 5. Please see the BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report (http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/Draft_BDCP_Statewide_Economic_Impact_Report_8-5-13.sflb.ashx), which indicates that the BDCP would result in a substantial net economic benefit to the State of California. An updated cost/benefit analysis is currently being conducted for the current preferred Alternative, 4A.
2068	1	Please add my name to those that oppose this "WaterFix" pipe dream of Governor Brown's. I am a native Californian (66 years old) and I am a voter. Our tax dollars should be spent on repairing the levee system, not ruining our Delta. We have seen the beginning of the salt migration and it will ruin our crop lands and drinking water supplies. San Francisco Bay has finally rebounded from years of abuse. The water that is allotted far exceeds the amount of water available. This project ignores the environmental impact and has removed the habitat restoration that was the original justification for this boondoggle. We all know that the cost overruns will make this project a drain of our tax dollars needed for roads and human services. Stop this madness!	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S. 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. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.
2069	1	I believe this project is not well-planned or thought-out on the basis of cost-to-benefit. As this extremely expensive project is currently planned it should be put to the public to vote upon.	DWR acknowledges your opposition to the project.
2069	2	There are other solutions to include conservation, desalinization [and] water storage facilities.	Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Additionally, please refer to Master Response 7 for information on desalination and why it was not included as a project alternative.
2069	3	It does not meet the "gold standard" for protection of the Delta as originally stated.	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).
2069	4	It has been stated that this project will cost sixty billion dollars but only be used 52% of the time depending upon the Sierra snowpack.	DWR acknowledges your opposition to the project. The project would cost approximately \$15 billion to build (not \$60 billion). There would be additional costs for mitigation of approximately \$800 million. The water would be used by the State and Federal water projects that supply drinking water for 25% of Californians, and for agricultural production throughout northern, central, and southern California. Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on the costs of project implementation.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
2069	5	There is no guarantee that 75% of the water flow should or will be maintained with perhaps 25% for export diversion.	<p>As described in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives Conservation Measure 1, of the EIR/EIS, one of the potential alternatives considered was based upon the State Water Resources Control Board 2010 Development of Flow Criteria for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Ecosystem, which described providing up to 75 percent of unimpaired flow into the Delta to improve aquatic resources habitat conditions. This potential alternative was not evaluated in detail because the flow recommendations in the 2010 report could not be achieved without adverse impacts to cold water management for fisheries in the Sacramento, Feather, and American rivers without reductions in non-SWP and non-CVP water rights diversions. The purpose and need of this EIR/EIS would not allow changes to non-SWP and non-CVP water rights. However, Alternatives 7 and 8 in the EIR/EIS reflect similar flow criteria in a manner that would only affect SWP and CVP water rights.</p> <p>As described in Section 6.3.4 of Chapter 6, Surface Water, of the EIR/EIS, the State Water Resources Control Board is conducting a current program to update the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan. Since this program is still under development and the potential outcomes are not known at this time, this program is not included in the analysis. Following completion of the updated Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan, SWP and CVP operations would need to be reviewed to determine if the operations continued to comply with the new regulations.</p>
2069	6	The bottom line is "no" to this approach. There are better solutions available which would be more cost-effective and fair to all the citizens of California.	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.
2070	1	If the people want water, let them move to the water, not the water move to them!	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S.
2071	1	The tunnel project is an environmental disaster and must be stopped! It will destroy the Delta which is already under attack from many polluting sources and excessive deletions which support agriculture and other activities. The Delta is a precious resource that is irreplaceable. There must be other more reasonable alternatives to this madness! I am personally 100% opposed to this project and so are all my friends and associates who have heard of this absolutely ridiculous plan to destroy one of the premier ecosystems in the entire country. The citizens of California will not allow this devastating plan to proceed.	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 federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental.
2072	1	I am strongly against building "tunnels" that would cost the taxpayers \$15 billion, money that could be well spent in education or decaying infrastructure.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Responses 5 (Cost and Funding).
2072	2	The water that is being "taken" from the San Joaquin-Sacramento area is greatly needed for our 4 million+ residents, as well as precious farmland. We have already built aqueducts in California that have for many years been pumping our area's precious water to Southern California. The "Twin Tunnels" are not an answer to the State's water problems and only make more problems for the Central Valley. I am a	The Proposed Project and all of the alternatives considered in this EIR/EIS would continue to use the SWP and CVP aqueducts referred to in this comment. The purpose of the project is to modify the location and operation of the intakes to those aqueducts to improve the SWP system in the Delta, water supplies of the SWP and CVP for users located south of the Delta, Delta water quality, and Delta habitat, as described in

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		registered voter and will make sure that any public official that supports this project will not get my vote and I will let anyone I know that votes be aware also!	<p>Section 2.3 of Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need, of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S.</p>
2073	1	I am absolutely appalled alternative plans have not been well-explored. I am equally disturbed that any mitigation measures for the environmental destruction and habitat restoration are not included in the plan, that the Endangered Species Act is being ignored and that this is [the] most costly and inefficient method of water transport and delivery that could have been devised.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project is going to mitigate for impacts and restore habitat for fish and wildlife listed in Section 4.3.7 and 4.3.8 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. The RDEIR/SDEIS addresses effects on special-status species, including non-listed species. Impacts that are going to potentially occur during the implementation timeline are fully disclosed with its associated mitigation measure to decrease the severity of said impact to covered species. Please see Appendix 1A Evaluation of Species Considered for Coverage of the BDCP for additional information on screening criteria of fish and wildlife species that were selected for the other 15 conveyance alternatives.</p> <p>Chapters 11 and 12 of the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS include in-depth, comprehensive analyses of potential effects on all endangered fish and wildlife known or expected to occur in the BDCP Plan Area.</p>
2073	2	There are better alternatives for providing clean, safe water for all Californians and conserving the Delta and its surrounding habitats.	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.
2074	1	In just over 100 years [since] my grandfather's birth, the Delta and its fisheries have been degraded to the point where it would be unrecognizable to him. The current plan of the Delta Tunnels/California WaterFix (Alternative 4A) will only further the degradation and destruction of our fisheries within the greatest estuary on the west coast of North America.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The preferred alternative, 4A, was evaluated in this EIR/EIS and the evaluation does not show that the Delta fisheries would be destroyed. Impacts to listed species and their habitats will be avoided, minimized, or mitigated. Additionally, the EFH assessment and consultation will occur concurrent with the ESA Section 7 consultation and based on the evaluation in the Biological Assessment, impacts to commercial fisheries is not expected.</p>
2075	1	While I understand that water is a limited resource and must be shared, I am against diverting water to large agriculture and in particular water-intensive almond and pistachio orchards. These are luxuries. Leave the water for the wildlife, which may never come back even if there is rain, if the water is taken from 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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, water quality standards, senior water rights, and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S. The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p>
2076	1	Small, efficient, organic, environmentally responsible farming is the answer to future food supply. Not more billion-dollar, environmentally damaging, big agriculture-specific moving of water all over the place. Stop big agriculture subsidization and help small farmers! Back to nature, not continued bad water habits of the past century in California!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for.</p>
2077	1	The Tunnels Project threatens to further diminish the health of the Delta and risks the extinction of several aquatic species, including Delta smelt and several Chinook salmon runs.	All comments received during the 2013-14 and 2015 public comment period are included in the FEIR/EIS. Please refer to the table of commenters to locate the letter of interest. 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.
2077	2	As was the case in the Draft EIR/EIS, Alternative 4A -- the new preferred alternative [Footnote 7: See RDEIR/SDEIS Executive Summary, p. ES-3, available at: http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/RDEIRS/0_ExecSumm.pdf .] -- fails to address the need for increased flows in the Delta. To the contrary, Alternative 4A would reduce Delta flows under many scenarios. ELC [Earth Law Center] raises two important legal issues in this regard: -first, the Tunnels Project will violate water quality standards under the CWA [Clean water Act], preventing necessary certification under CWA Section 401 (401 Certification); and -second, if Alternative 4A is integrated into the Bay-Delta Plan, the resultant flows will	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the 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. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water timing the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The incremental changes in Delta outflow under Alternative 4A compared to baseline conditions are a function of both the facility and operations assumptions, including north Delta intakes capacity of 9,000 cfs,</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>fail to protect the most sensitive beneficial uses, as required by the CWA.</p> <p>At minimum, the Tunnels Project should be recirculated for public review after being revised to meet CWA requirements.</p>	<p>OMR flow requirements, Fall X2 requirements, and the reduction in water supply availability due to increased north of Delta urban demands, sea level rise, and climate change (the last three assumptions, plus Fall X2 requirements, are included in both the No Action Alternative (ELT) and Alternative 4A, but not in Existing Conditions). Results for the range of changes in Delta outflow under Alternative 4A are presented in more detail in Appendix 5A, BDCP/California WaterFix EIR/S Modeling Technical Appendix. Changes in long-term average Delta outflow under Alternative 4A (ELT) as compared to the No Action Alternative (ELT) and Existing Conditions are shown in Figures 5-37 through 5-39 and Tables 5-10 through 5-12 in Chapter 5.</p> <p>To summarize, changes in Delta outflow under Alternative 4A, late-fall and winter outflows remain similar or show minor reductions in Alternative 4A (ELT) compared to No Action Alternative (ELT) and are slightly higher relative to Existing Conditions. In the spring months, outflow would remain similar under Alternative 4A (ELT) as compared to No Action Alternative (ELT), and would be slightly reduced compared to Existing Conditions. In the fall months, outflow under Alternative 4A would increase relative to Existing Conditions, and as compared to the No Action Alternative (ELT), would be similar because of Fall X2 requirements in wet and above-normal years. With regards to water quality, please see Master Response 14. With regards to operational criteria, please see Master Response 28.</p>
2077	3	<p>ELC [Earth Law Center] also asks that Lead Agencies examine establishment of a statewide system of instream water rights to protect the needs of both humans and Delta species.</p>	<p>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 rights nor include any regulatory actions that would affect water rights holders other than DWR, Reclamation, and SWP and CVP contractors.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 32 for further discussion of water rights issues.</p>
2077	4	<p>Implementation of the Tunnels Project will violate water quality standards under the CWA [Clean Water Act], preventing necessary 401 Certification.</p> <p>In order to proceed, the Tunnels Project must receive both a CWA Section 404 permit and 401 Certification of that permit's compliance with the CWA. First, the Tunnels Project requires a CWA Section 404 permit since it will result the discharge of dredged or fill materials into waters of the United States. [Footnote 8: See California Department of Water Resources, Clean Water Act Section 404 Application (submitted to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) (Aug. 24, 2015), at: www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/docs/ca_waterfix/cawaterfix404permit_app.pdf.] The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) filed an application for a CWA Section 404 permit with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) on August 24, 2015. [Footnote 9: Id.] In turn, CWA Section 401 requires the SWRCB to certify that the Corps' Section 404 permit meets CWA requirements before the permit may be legally issued. [Footnote 10: CWA [Section] 401 certification is necessary for any "[f]ederal license or permit to conduct any activity . . . [that] may result in any discharge into navigable waters." 33 U.S.C. [Section] 1341(a)(1).] The DWR filed for 401 Certification from the SWRCB on September 23, 2015. [Footnote 11: California Department of Water Resources, Clean Water Act [Section] 401 Water Quality Certification Application Form (submitted to State Water Resources Control Board) (Sept. 23, 2015), at: www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/water_quality_cert/docs</p>	<p>Regarding the applicability of Section 401 certification, the commenter is not correct in implying that a project cannot change water quality conditions in an adverse way and obtain authorization under Section 401. Section 401 is a permit process that may (and typically does) include terms and conditions for the project in question to promote or require avoidance, reduction, and minimization of potential adverse water quality effects. The project will be required to meet applicable water quality standards as they exist now and as they may be revised in the future.</p> <p>As described in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, EIR/EIS, comments and suggestions received from the State Water Board were influential in defining the range and content of alternatives considered in the EIR/EIS, including the State Water Board's Delta Flow Criteria Report, prepared pursuant to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Reform Act of 2009. Scoping comments from the State Water Board included requests for an alternative providing for reduced diversions and an alternative incorporating changes to Delta outflows (and potentially inflows) that would reflect a more natural hydrograph. The Lead Agencies determined that an additional alternative would be required to be responsive to the State Water Board's comments. Informed by these comments, as well as several letters from the State Water Board to the Natural Resources Agency, DWR met with State Water Board staff to identify a general approach to model an increased spring Delta outflow alternative. This alternative was designed to increase spring Delta outflow by approximately 1.5 million acre-feet, on average, above the NEPA baseline assumptions. This became Alternative 8 as analyzed in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Consideration of the specific determination contained in the Delta Flow Criteria Report, which identified 75% of unimpaired net Delta outflow for January through June, would not have been feasible to include as an alternative in the EIR/EIS. A letter from the Executive Director of the State Water Board to the deputy</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>s/ca_waterfix/cawaterfix401cert_app.pdf.]</p> <p>One requirement for Section 401 Certification is for the proposed project to meet water quality standards under CWA Section 303. [Footnote 12: 33 U.S.C. [Section] 1341(d). According to [Section] 401(d), certification "shall set forth any effluent limitations and other limitations . . . necessary to assure that any applicant" complies with certain provisions of the CWA. The Supreme Court in PUD No. 1 of Jefferson County v. Washington Department of Ecology held that this includes CWA [Section] 303, since [Section] 301 incorporates it by reference. PUD No. 1 of Jefferson County v. Washington Department of Ecology, 511 U.S. 700, at 713-715 (1994) (PUD No. 1). A state agency may also condition, deny or waive certification under certain circumstances. 33 U.S.C. [Section] 1341(a)(1)-(2). As implementing U.S. EPA regulations assert [Footnote 13: The Supreme Court held that the EPA's interpretation is consistent with the CWA in PUD No. 1.], 401 Certification "shall" include a statement providing a "reasonable assurance that the activity will be conducted in a manner which will not violate applicable water quality standards." [Footnote 14: 40 CFR [Section] 121.2(a)(3); PUD No. 1 at 712.] Such water quality standards encompass both the designated uses of a water body and the water quality criteria established to protect those uses, as well as antidegradation requirements. [Footnote 15: 33 U.S.C. 1313(c)(2)(A) (emphasis added); PUD No. 1 at 704. In addition to the uses to be protected and the criteria to protect those uses, water quality standards include an antidegradation policy to ensure that the standards are "sufficient to maintain existing beneficial uses of navigable waters, preventing their further degradation." PUD No. 1 at 705; 33 U.S.C. 1313(d)(4)(B); 40 CFR [Section] 131.6. EPA regulations add that "[e]xisting instream water uses and the level of water quality necessary to protect the existing uses shall be maintained and protected." 40 CFR [Section] 131.12. In other words, "a project that does not comply with a designated [i.e., beneficial] use of the water does not comply with the applicable water quality standards." [Footnote 16: PUD No. 1, 511 U.S. at 715. See also 40 CFR [Section] 131.3(b) (U.S. EPA stating that "[w]hen criteria are met, water quality will generally protect the designated use," indicating that numerical criteria do not always by themselves protect a designated use).] Further, 401 Certification considers the impact of an entire project -- not just the impacts of the discharge that triggers CWA Section 401. [Footnote 17: PUD No. 1, 511 U.S. 700 (1994). PUD No. 1 established that so long as there is a discharge, the state can regulate an activity as a whole under [Section] 401. PUD No. 1 at 711-712.]</p>	<p>secretary of the Natural Resources Agency on April 19, 2011 recognized that the determination did not consider the competing needs for water or other public trust resource needs, such as the need to manage cold-water resources in tributaries to the Delta. Further, implementation of these flows would also likely affect water users beyond those receiving CVP and SWP deliveries south of the Delta. As described in Section 3A.3.5, alternatives requiring impairment of senior water rights held by entities not participating in the BDCP were eliminated from full consideration in the EIR/EIS, as such rights could not be infringed by CDFW, USFWS, or NMFS through those agencies' actions or through "ESA Section 7 consultation" with Reclamation.</p> <p>For additional supplemental modeling requested by the SWRCB related please see Appendix C of the RDEIR/SDIES.</p>
2077	5	<p>The obligation to meet water quality standards for [Clean Water Act (CWA)] 401 Certification applies in regard to both water "quality" and "quantity." As to the latter, where a project alters flows such that one or more beneficial use(s) are no longer supported, then water quality standards have been violated. The U.S. Supreme Court itself recognized in PUD No.1 v. Washington Department of Ecology that ". . . a sufficient lowering of the water quantity in a body of water could destroy all of its designated uses, be it for drinking water, recreation, navigation, or . . . a fishery." [Footnote 18: Id. at 719 (May 31, 1994).] Additionally, the CWA requires criteria based on science that protect the most sensitive beneficial use (i.e., they cannot "balance" away uses) [Footnote 19: EPA regulations state that "criteria must be based on sound scientific rationale and must contain sufficient parameters or constituents to protect the designated use. For waters with multiple use designations, the criteria shall support the most sensitive use." See 40 CFR [Section] 131.11; see also 40 CFR [Section] 131.6.], including within the context of flows. Thus flow regimes that "reasonably protect" rather than "protect" a beneficial use are insufficient under the federal CWA.</p>	<p>The proposed intakes would only be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. Flow criteria will be applied month by month and according to water year type. More information on the ranges of water project diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in BDCP, Chapter 3, Conservation Strategy.</p> <p>Monitoring for compliance with applicable water quality standards or any future requirements for SWP/CVP water supply operations would be conducted year-round in the future under the proposed project.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		As the state Supreme Court found [Footnote 20: Calif. Water Code [Section] 13000.], state law "cannot authorize what federal law forbids."	
2077	6	<p>Numerous beneficial uses [of water] in the Delta imply a certain amount of flow to support that use. In its August 2010 flow criteria report, the SWRCB identified the minimum amount of unimpaired flow that would protect Delta fish species and habitats, also recognizing that "[r]ecent Delta flows are insufficient to support native Delta fishes for today's habitats." [Footnote 21: 21 See SWRCB, "Development of Flow Criteria for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Ecosystem" (Aug. 3, 2010), available at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/deltaflow/docs/final_rpt080310.pdf [hereinafter "2010 Flow Report"].]</p> <p>However, the flow regimes incorporated by the Tunnels Project fall well short of the specific minimum flows specifically identified in the August 2010 flow criteria report as protecting Delta fish species. [Footnote 22: Specifically, SWRCB's August 2010 flow criteria report used science to identify the minimum amount of unimpaired flow that would protect Delta fish species and habitats, namely 75% unimpaired Delta outflow from January through June, 75% unimpaired Sacramento River inflow from November through June, and 60% unimpaired San Joaquin River inflow from February through June. SWRCB, 2010 Flow Report at 2, 54.] Instead, the proposed flow regimes -- including for Alternative 4A -- are largely equivalent to those that have been failing to protect Delta ecosystems and species for years, and would actually result in reduced flows under many scenarios. For example, Alternative 4A would result in a decrease in annual Delta outflow compared to the No Action Alternative, both when averaging all water year types and for critical water years only (under both Scenario H3 and H4). [Footnote 23: RDEIR/SDEIS, Appendix B ("Supplemental Modeling Results for New Alternatives"), p. B-40, at: http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/RDEIRS/Ap_B_Supp%20Alt.pdf.] Similarly, for the period of January through June (the time period during which the August 2010 flow criteria report called for an increase of outflow to 75 percent of unimpaired Delta outflow), Alternative 4A would result in a decrease in Delta outflow compared to the No Action Alternative, again when averaging all water year types and for critical water years only (under both Scenario H3 and H4). Compared to Existing Conditions for January through June, in both averaged and critical water years types, Alternative 4A would result in a decrease in Delta outflow under Scenario H3 and a less than 1 percent increase in outflow under Scenario H4. [Footnote 24: Id. at Table B.7-31 ("Mean Monthly Flows (cfs [cubic feet per second]) for Model Scenarios at the Delta Outflow, Year-Round").]</p>	<p>As described in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives Conservation Measure 1, of the EIR/EIS, one of the potential alternatives considered was based upon the State Water Resources Control Board 2010 Development of Flow Criteria for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Ecosystem, which described providing up to 75 percent of unimpaired flow into the Delta to improve aquatic resources habitat conditions. This potential alternative was not evaluated in detail because the flow recommendations in the 2010 report could not be achieved without adverse impacts to cold water management for fisheries in the Sacramento, Feather, and American rivers and without reductions in non-SWP and non-CVP water rights diversions. The purpose and need of this EIR/EIS would not allow changes to non-SWP and non-CVP water rights. However, Alternatives 7 and 8 in the EIR/EIS reflect similar flow criteria in a manner that would only affect SWP and CVP water rights.</p> <p>The proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high to improve conditions for aquatic resources in the Delta. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods.</p> <p>See Master Response 17 for more information on Biological Resources. For additional information regarding water rights, please see Master Response 32.</p>
2077	7	<p>Due to the planned north Delta Diversions, the RDEIR/SDEIS projects monthly lower Sacramento River flows to decrease between 20 and 24 percent. [Footnote 25: Estimates derived by Restore the Delta from graphical analysis interpolating data in Figures 4.3.2-7 and 4.3.2-8 from the Recirculated Draft EIR/EIS, Section 4.3. See also Appendix B, Tables B.7-28 (downstream of north Delta intakes), B.7-30 (Sacramento River at Rio Vista), B.7-32 (Delta outflow), and B.7-34 (San Joaquin River at Vernalis), pp. B-357 to B-370. These tables show that most changes are decreases in flow of 5 percent or more compared with both Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative. Only slight improvements occur in just a handful of months and water year types.] Thus federally protected salmonids migrating down the Sacramento River will generally experience lower migration flows compared to existing conditions. As a result of reduced flows and other impacts to the Delta, through-Delta survival rates of the</p>	<p>The text included in the comment describes only part of the CEQA conclusions. The rest of the conclusions indicate that these findings do not consider future climate change. In doing so, it allows a fair comparison of future conditions with and without the effect of the project. As a result, the analysis indicates that the effects would be less than significant. Further, a reduction in flows does not mandate an adverse or significant effect to fish species.</p> <p>Reducing the reliance on through-Delta conveyance via the Delta Cross Channel and intakes in the south Delta will also substantially reduce the effects of existing flow anomalies, such as weak flows or reverse flows on salmonids in the San Joaquin River system and tributaries, Mokelumne River, and other eastside tributaries. Although there would be some increased entrainment exposure for Sacramento River salmonids due to the presence of the new north Delta diversions, these effects would be minimized by fish screens,</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		juvenile and smolt life stages of winter-run, spring-run, fall-run and late-fall-run Chinook salmon are all expected to decrease relative to both Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative. The RDEIR/SDEIS itself recognizes that "[u]nder Alternative 4A (including climate change effects), there are flow and storage reductions, as well as temperature increases in the Sacramento River that would lead to biologically meaningful increases in egg mortality rates and overall reduced habitat conditions for spawning spring-run and egg incubation." [Footnote 26: RDEIR/SDEIS, Section 4.3, p. 4.3.7-98.]	sweeping and approach velocity criteria, and other operational parameters.
2077	8	The Tunnels Project will fail to protect multiple beneficial uses of affected waterways and will violate water quality standards. These beneficial uses include "rare, threatened or endangered species habitat," "estuarine habitat," "spawning, reproduction, and/or early development," and other sensitive beneficial uses that will be impacted further by the project. [Footnote 27: SWRCB, "Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary," p. 9 (Dec. 13, 2006), available at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/wq_control_plans/2006wqcp/docs/2006_plan_final.pdf .]	The potential for water conveyance operations to affect contaminant concentrations and exceed applicable water quality objectives in the affected environment 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, in the EIR/EIS. Where significant impacts to beneficial uses would occur due to the alternative, mitigation to lessen those impacts is provided. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 2077-4 and 2077-5, above. Additionally, with regards to water quality, please see Master Response 14.
2077	9	Because it cannot meet water quality standards, the Tunnels Project cannot obtain the required 401 Certification it needs for a CWA [Clean Water Act] Section 404 permit to advance the project. In order to receive the CWA Section 404 permit, Lead Agencies must revise and recirculate the Tunnels Project with a new reasonable alternative that sufficiently increases flows to ensure the full protection of all beneficial uses.	The assessment of potential water quality effects of the project alternatives fulfills a primary public disclosure purpose of the CEQA and NEPA process. The Clean Water Act section 404 and 401 regulatory compliance processes are separate from the CEQA/NEPA process, involve their own procedures and policies. Please refer also to Responses to Comments 2077-4 and 2077-5, above.
2077	10	If the flow regime in the proposed Tunnels Project (particularly for the new Preferred Alternative, Alternative 4A) is integrated into the state's upcoming revisions to its Bay-Delta Plan, the resultant flow objective(s) will fail to protect the most sensitive beneficial uses, as required by the CWA. Under the CWA, the state must adopt science-based flow criteria that protect (not "reasonably" protect) the most sensitive beneficial use. However, the Tunnels Project alternatives (including those described in the RDEIR/SDEIS) are based on levels of instream flow that are widely considered to be inadequate to protect Delta fish and habitats. For example, looking at monthly averages of the flow differences between Alternative 4A, existing conditions, and the No Action Alternative for different water type years in the Sacramento River below the north Delta diversion facilities, most months in all water scenarios show a decrease in flows of greater than five percent, with only a few months showing an increase in flows. Additional efforts to ostensibly enhance flow (e.g. north Delta diversion bypass flow) still fall significantly short of what is needed to prevent violations of beneficial uses necessary to protect Delta systems and species.	The State Water Resources Control Board is preparing an updated Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan. This plan is considering reasonable protection of beneficial uses, including municipal and industrial uses, agricultural uses, and environmental uses; and sustainable management practices. Following completion of the updated Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan, the SWP and CVP operations would need to be reviewed to determine if the operations under the current conditions and under the proposed project would comply with the new regulations. If the SWP and CVP operations did not comply with the adopted Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan, DWR and Reclamation would initiate further engineering and environmental analyses to achieve compliance with the adopted requirements.
2077	11	ELC [Earth Law Center] is concerned that the Tunnels Project is attempting to circumvent the ongoing public process to update the Bay-Delta Plan. Such changes to Delta flows and hydrodynamics must be evaluated through public review before the SWRCB, the only state body authorized to change water quality standards. Tunnels Project proponents should not attempt to circumvent the process by making Tunnels operational criteria seem inevitable and necessary; they are neither. Instead, potentially necessary flow criteria must be the subject of careful and critical review in the SWRCB's Bay-Delta Plan update process, including review for consistency with the CWA [Clean Water Act], before the Tunnels Project may move forward.	The commenter correctly states that the SWRCB is the governing body charged with setting Delta outflow requirements. The BDCP/California WaterFix EIR/EIS developed operational scenarios and flow criteria with input from the SWRCB but the SWRCB process for reviewing and updating the Water Quality Control Plan for the Bay-Delta Plan is ongoing. Ultimately the proposed project will be required to meet standards that are set in the Bay-Delta Plan.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
2077	12	<p>An important, yet unexamined, path forward lies in creation of a comprehensive, instream water rights program that protects ecosystems and species. If water rights are to be the legal system by which water is allocated, then the law must reflect the science and ethics of our integration with our environment: legal water rights for waterways must be developed, allocated, and enforced to support water needs for healthy aquatic ecosystems and a healthy California. The alternatives analysis of the Draft EIR/EIS and the new RDEIR/SDEIS must include consideration of this important legal and policy avenue. Alternatives describing "all appropriate methods of accomplishing the aim of the action" [Footnote 29: Environmental Defense Fund v. Corps of Engineers of United States Army, 492 F.2d 1123, 1135 (5th Cir. 1974); 40 C.F.R. [Section] 1502.14(c)] -- which includes restoration of Delta habitats and species and a reliable water supply for California -- must be considered, "including those without the area of the agency's expertise and regulatory control as well as those within it." [Footnote 30: Id.; 40 C.F.R. [Section] 1502.14(c). Again, "legislative action" (such as that which may be needed to establish a program of instream water rights) "does not automatically justify excluding [the alternative] from an EIS." City of Sausalito v. O'Neill, 386 F.3d 1186, 1208 (9th Cir. 2004) (citing Methow Valley Citizens Council v. Regional Forester, 833 F.2d 810, 815 (9th Cir. 1987), overruled on other grounds by Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council, 490 U.S. 332 (1989) (quoting City of Angoon, 803 F.2d at 1021); see also Kilroy v. Ruckelshaus, 738 F.2d 1448, 1454 (9th Cir.1984) ("In some cases an alternative may be reasonable, and therefore required by NEPA to be discussed in the EIS, even though it requires legislative action to put it into effect").]</p> <p>Formalizing and effectuating water rights for ecosystems will ensure that waterway and fish needs are considered up front, that planning is effective, and that implementation and enforcement are clear. California is undertaking various processes now that could set state water policy for decades. These must include consideration of water rights for waterways, to ensure the mutual well-being of the state's people and environment.</p>	<p>As described in the Response to Comment 2077-3 above, 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. The EIR/EIS compares the conditions under the proposed project and other action alternatives as compared to the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative to determine the effects of the proposed project and other action alternatives. The range of alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS was developed in accordance with the project objectives and purpose and need statement for this project (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/EIS) which does not include development of a comprehensive instream water rights program.</p> <p>Please refer also to Master Response 3 for further discussion of purpose and need, and Master Response 4 regarding alternatives development.</p>
2077	13	<p>One example of advancement of waterway rights in law is found in Oregon's Instream Water Rights Act (IWRA). The IWRA recognized a broad array of instream uses as beneficial uses [Footnote 31: O.R.S. [Sections] 537.332 - 537.334 (recognizing that public uses that are valid instream uses include "conservation, maintenance and enhancement of aquatic and fish life, wildlife, fish and wildlife habitat and any other ecological values")], converted minimum flow requirements to instream rights [Footnote 32: IRWA converted all minimum streamflows established under the 1955 Minimum Perennial Streamflow Act to instream water rights. O.R.S. [Section] 537.346.], and established a streamlined system to convert water rights to instream uses. [Footnote 33: O.R.S. [Section] 537.348.] Not only did the IWRA create instream water rights for waterways throughout Oregon, but it also began to create a "culture of flow restoration" [Footnote 34: Janet Neuman et al., Sometimes a Great Notion: Oregon's Instream Flow Experiments, 36 Env'tl. Law 1125 (2006)] in which conservation groups, regional land trusts, state agencies and others became partners for waterway health. While there are limitations in Oregon's program -- such as the fact that newly established instream water rights in Oregon are often junior to most offstream (human) water rights -- California could address these through careful crafting of its own initiative.</p>	<p>As described in the Responses to Comments 2077-3 and 2077-12 above, the State Water Resources Control Board, not DWR, is responsible for decisions relating to water rights. In addition, Reclamation does not have authority to establish state water rights. The range of alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS was developed in accordance with the project objectives and purpose and need statement for this project (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/EIS) which does not include development of a comprehensive instream water rights program.</p> <p>With regards to purpose and need, please see Master Response 3. With regards to water rights, please see Master Response 14.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
2077	14	One element of [a water rights] initiative would be the acquisition of instream flows where waterways are already fully appropriated or over-allocated. An initial step toward implementation of this element could be a requirement, similar to Oregon's Allocation of Conserved Water Program, to set aside for instream uses a percentage of water conserved with public funds. Other strategies for "finding" water for waterways include: (1) appropriately applying the waste and unreasonable use provisions of the State Constitution and California Water Code [Footnote 35: See CA Water Code Water Code [Section] 100; see also Article X, Section 2 of the California Constitution]; (2) increasing fees on diversions to encourage voluntary release of unneeded rights; (3) determining and acting on public trust violations; (4) conducting initiatives to convince existing water rights holders to give up their water rights voluntarily; and (5) adjudicating water rights. All of these are within agencies' purview now. If applied toward the development of an instream water rights program in California, such combined strategies would better ensure that we meet the water needs of both humans and the environment, both now and in the long term.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts. 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. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/DEIS were raised.
2077	15	[ATT1: BDCP Letter #1636.]	All comments received during the 2013 and 2015 public comment periods are included in the FEIR/EIS. Please refer to the table of commenters to locate the letter of interest.
2077	16	[ATT2: ATT1 of BDCP Letter #1636.]	All comments received during the 2013 and 2015 public comment periods are included in the FEIR/EIS. Please refer to the table of commenters to locate the letter of interest.
2077	17	[ATT3: ATT2 of BDCP Letter #1636.]	All comments received during the 2013 and 2015 public comment periods are included in the FEIR/EIS. Please refer to the table of commenters to locate the letter of interest.
2077	18	[ATT4: ATT3 of BDCP Letter #1636.]	All comments received during the 2013 and 2015 public comment periods are included in the FEIR/EIS. Please refer to the table of commenters to locate the letter of interest.
2078	1	The proposed tunnels would devastate the Delta, while doing very little to mitigate the drought and provide long-term water supplies. The solution to the drought is not more infrastructure, but rather more wisely using the resources we have through conservation, reduced and more efficient agriculture, and water recycling.	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. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Appendix 1C of the Final EIR/EIS, Demand Management Measures, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. Refer to Master Response 6 for more information on demand management. Although components such as desalination plants and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the State, they are beyond the scope of the project. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives.
2079	1	We must protect these habitats now!	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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).
2080	1	Are you morons serious? Do you ever do the right thing or is it just all about you [and] how much greedy blood money you can collect in bribes?	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the 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>
2081	1	Our Bay-Delta ecosystem needs to remain completely intact. It's our responsibility to care for our environment.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
2082	1	The destruction of irreplaceable agricultural, recreational, commercial and residential lands and resources: once done, there is no way to undo or mitigate the damage this project will do.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the 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> <p>Regarding the concerns related to the effects to habitat, the proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the Clean Water Act as well as federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The effects of the project on agricultural resources were extensively addressed in the EIR/S. Impacts were evaluated and mitigation proposed to mediate the adverse effects.</p> <p>Please see FEIR/EIS Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, Impact AG-1 and Impact AG-2 and their associated mitigation measures for complete analysis of how the proposed project will effect and mitigate for effects on important farmland in the Delta.</p>
2082	2	It is not a solution to the water shortage when there is no water!	<p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal and state regulating agencies. The hydrologic analysis in the EIR/S considered changes over long-term conditions which includes high flow events and drought periods, conditions similar to the 1976-1977 and 1987-1992 droughts, as described in Appendix 5A, Modeling Technical Appendix. The EIR/EIS analysis did not evaluate emergency operations conditions such as during the recent drought because separate environmental documentation is prepared for those conditions.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, including those of non-SWP and non-CVP water users; and it is not an attempt to address directly the need</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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).
2082	3	Tourism/recreation are vital to the economic strength of Northern California. The proposed Delta Tunnels project will severely impact that strong revenue source for our region.	Please refer to Alternative 4A in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, Impact ECON-1 regarding temporary effects on regional economics and employment, ECON-3 regarding changes in community character, and ECON-4 regarding changes in local government fiscal conditions.
2082	4	Alternative solutions to the problem of scarce water resources for all of California have not been given equal weight and consideration.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives. Also, please see Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management.
2082	5	The process of developing this plan has not been transparent to all concerned. Equal benefit to all citizens is not evident.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
2082	6	The Delta Tunnels/California WaterFix should be stopped.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
2083	1	I own and operate a small -- 54.6 acre -- farm in Linden. I am opposed to the BDCP Delta Tunnels for all of the reasons everyone in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Region is. This plan will devastate our entire environment and economy, and will not provide an extra drop of water to metropolitan Southern California.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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>
2083	2	The real motive for this bad plan is to ship our water to irrigate large corporate-owned almond orchards. These orchards should never have been planted in an area that does not have the water to sustain thousands and thousands of acres of nut trees.	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.
2083	3	There are 55 watersheds in the state of California. The Regional Water Quality Control Board wants each of them to come up with a plan to make their water more sustainable. The Board also realizes that crops have changed since the last drought in 1977. More acreage has been planted in crops that take more water such as nut trees.	<p>The State Water Resources Control Board and Regional Water Quality Control Boards are preparing basin plans for the watersheds throughout California and an updated Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan. These plans are considering reasonable protection of beneficial uses, including municipal and industrial uses, agricultural uses, and environmental uses; and sustainable management practices. Following completion of the updated Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan and related basin plans, the SWP and CVP operations would need to be reviewed to determine if the operations under the proposed project would comply with the new regulations.</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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor any change in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.</p> <p>The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p>
2083	4	We are in a four-year drought, and with climate change, we are facing a scary future. We need to protect our water for our children and grandchildren and the following generations. We are not in a position to be diverting our most precious resource, our water.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
2083	5	There is nothing regionally sustainable about the BDCP Tunnels Plan.	Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. 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).
2083	6	People need to start rethinking their ideas about what to grow. The bottom financial line is what all growers look at, but that bottom line is not necessarily what is best for the area. The tunnels fix merely provides water for greedy corporations to plant a monoculture of whatever is currently bringing in the biggest income, and leaves the rest of the population out of the equation.	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.
2084	1	<p>Plants without water die!!!!</p> <p>When one has three buckets of water and one is taken, you only have two left to work with. Mother Nature made us with three buckets. Removing one will not carry us!!!</p> <p>Build storage facilities in the South to retain the massive amounts of water that is lost down the cement rivers.</p>	Please see Master Response 37 regarding water storage.
2085	1	For a group of people who claim to be environmentalists, how in the world do Governor Brown and his cronies sleep at night knowing they will destroy the Delta region by draining the fresh water for the tunnel project? We already have an issue with salt-water creeping further and further inland; wells in the valley are showing signs of salt water. By draining the fresh water from our region to sell to Southern Californians and their swimming pools, this project will destroy thousands of acres of	By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. The proposed project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports). Although the proposed project would

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		wetlands.	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. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 14 (Water Quality), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
2086	1	I strongly oppose the construction of the water tunnels, which will divert water from the Delta to the Central Valley and to Southern California. The farmers in the Central Valley have continued to be extremely irresponsible in the way they use water. They are sucking the aquifer dry and there is has been no stringent legislation to ration water and to distribute it in a limited and equitable fashion. The farmers are continuing to uproot crops that use limited water and replacing them with almond and pistachio trees that require huge amounts of water. Whenever I've driven through the Central Valley, I see almond orchards that are flooded.	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.
2086	2	The citizens of Northern California have done an excellent job in heeding the governor's directive to conserve water. In our own household, our water use has decreased by 46.6% from our use in 2013. In Northern California we have exceeded the call for reducing water use by 25%. Are the citizens really scrimping and saving so the Central Valley farmers can squander it?	All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal and state regulating agencies. The hydrologic analysis in the EIR/S considered changes over long-term conditions which includes high flow events and drought periods, conditions similar to the 1976-1977 and 1987-1992 droughts, as described in Appendix 5A, Modeling Technical Appendix. The EIR/EIS analysis did not evaluate emergency operations conditions such as during the recent drought because separate environmental documentation is prepared for those conditions. 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).
2086	3	I am extremely dismayed that this project has had no involvement from the legislature. Shouldn't such a massive water project be decided by the people of California or by the legislature? Instead, it has all been planned behind closed doors by certain interest groups that have clearly ignored the wishes of the public. The public already spoke on the issue two decades ago when we voted against the Peripheral Canal.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Chapter 32 of the Final EIR/EIS and Master Response 64 for information regarding outreach conducted for California WaterFix (and previously the BDCP). More information on how DWR has developed the project in an open and transparent manner is provided in Master Response 41.
2086	4	The harm to the San Francisco Bay and to several fish species has been clearly delineated by many environmental organizations and by the federal government. I respectfully urge Governor Brown to rescind this harmful project.	The commenter does not offer any evidence on how the project would result in Delta ecosystem and aquatic impacts related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
2087	1	Oh my god, some people did a poll of 1,500 people in California which has a population of 38,000,000 and came up with an answer to what was needed to be done regarding the tunnels. Who in heaven's name would believe what good that would do with coming up with an accurate and true feeling of the people living in California?	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
2088	1	Please stop the tunnel project! It will kill the delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
2093	1	The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta. Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.	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 the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish and

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
2093	2	Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.	<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> <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 (Purpose and Need) for additional information.</p>
2094	1	Let's not do the Delta Tunnels Project. I live in Missouri and I love almonds, but I no longer buy them, given the drought in your state and the other misuses of water occurring there (e.g., Nestlé's continual taking of water from the state when some of its citizens have none). We don't need to ruin the land for private 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>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>
2096	1	I have a boat and spend a lot of time on the Delta. I am very opposed to the twin tunnel project. [The] Delta has enough problems. I will not support a candidate in favor of the tunnels.	The proposed project may impact recreational opportunities including impacts on hunting, fishing, swimming, and boating. Mitigation is proposed to reduce these impacts; however some impacts may remain significant due to the long-term nature of the temporary construction related impacts. Please see Chapter 15, Recreation, and Section 4.3.11 for more detail on the impacts of the proposed project on recreational opportunities and the proposed mitigation.
2097	1	The Bay Delta Conservation Plan (the "Delta Tunnels") is a badly thought out plan that	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		will decimate the fish and destroy the California Delta and as such, I would like this e-mail registered as a firm "NO" against the plan.	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.
2098	1	<p>I live and work on a five generation family farm outside of Rio Vista, California. I am an avid stand-up paddler on local waters.</p> <p>Please consider the many viable and economically responsible alternatives to the seriously flawed, outmoded, and destructive Delta Tunnels/California WaterFix Plan. I strongly oppose this insanely expensive, environmentally catastrophic plan. I support the principles of the Delta Reform Act; this plan does not.</p>	<p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <p>For more information regarding the proposed project's compliance with the Delta Reform Act please see Master Response 31.</p>
2099	1	I am a lifelong resident of San Joaquin County. I cherish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. I know how important the Delta is to our local economy. The Delta's integrity cannot withstand the current proposed project. If the current project is implemented, it will be detrimental for all of the residents of San Joaquin County and the environment. I was an intern in then-Senator John Garamendi's office in 1982. I became well-versed on the proposed Peripheral Canal. The concerns then remain the same to this day. There has to be a better compromise to send water to Southern California without forever changing a unique and important part of the state of California. I urge the Governor, the DWR and the US Bureau of Reclamation to shelve the current WaterFix proposal and find a more reasonable solution for water diversion.	The Lead Agencies discuss community character in Chapter 16 of the EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A (Socioeconomics) identifies the unique features of the Delta and describes the potential effects on Delta communities. Please see chapter 15 for a discussion on impacts to recreation. Impacts to agriculture are identified and discussed in Chapter 14; project proponents have proposed measures that would support and protect agricultural production in the Delta by securing agricultural easements and/or by seeking opportunities to protect and enhance agriculture with a focus on maintaining economic activity on agricultural lands. Please see Master Response 18 for more information on agricultural mitigation.