

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
2900	1	We need to leave Nature the way it is! Mother Nature truly knows best. We must work in harmony with her, not try and completely change her course. The water ways need to stay the way they are. Less development and more open space is what California needs.	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. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
2900	2	Stop worrying so much about creating a tax base and developing every square inch of California. It is being destroyed. There is not enough water to support all these humans. Stop attracting them with more housing and shopping malls. It is out of control!	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. The proposed project does not include additional housing or shopping malls. Please refer to Impact ECON-2 and 8 under Alternative 4A, of Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, regarding housing and population; these impacts would be not adverse/less than significant.
2901	1	How does destroying the Delta benefit anyone?	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the 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>
2902	1	Please pay attention to the message below. The answer to the water crisis is not by more draining and channeling, it is by reducing global pollution. You are only destroying the earth with your plans for draining the Delta even more. Please let the creeks, rivers, trees and mountains recover with help from less pollution. That is the only solution.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>As discussed in Chapter 22, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, construction of the water conveyance facilities will result in short-term criteria pollutant and greenhouse gas emissions. The lead agencies have developed a comprehensive and aggressive mitigation strategy to address air quality and associated human health effects associated with construction emissions (see Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments). The measures outlined in Appendix 3B reflect the latest emissions control strategies based on currently available technologies and will substantially reduce onsite emissions generated during construction. Emissions in excess of local air district thresholds or federal de minimis thresholds will be further mitigated through implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1, AQ-3, and AQ-4.</p> <p>As noted in Chapter 22, many of the conservation measures would expand and restore natural areas. While a detailed land use sequestration assessment is beyond the scope of the program-level analysis, many of the restored land use types would sequester carbon from the atmosphere into plant biomass and soil. Refer to the BDCP Draft Statewide Economic Impact Analysis for a preliminary assessment of greenhouse gas flux associated with implementation of the Project. The Draft Economic Study can be downloaded here: http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/News/News/13-08-05/BDCP_Draft_Statewide_Economic_Analysis_Released.aspx.</p>
2903	1	This plan is counter productive to the health and needs of the Delta and natural flows of the water. It really does nothing to improve the water's quantity but simply changes directions and destroy the wildlife and the economic factors within the Delta. It is a	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		huge expense and will bring no positive outcome to the Delta. Seems like this might be a pet project for economic enhancement and doing nothing for the water or the people and wildlife that use responsibly that area. Please vote no on this bill.	<p>index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The 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. 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>
2904	1	Climate change predicts a continued and increasing drought in California and western North America. We will need massive desalination plants to meet our water needs, not water diversion.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Desalination may indeed be one of the adaptation strategies needed in California. However, no single strategy will likely be enough to address all of the impacts of climate change. As stated in Chapter 29 of the DEIR/S, No single project and indeed none of the action alternatives would be able to completely counteract all of the impacts of climate change; however, as shown below the action alternatives provide important added resilience and adaptability to many of the expected changes.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding desalination.</p>
2905	1	For the amount of money to pay for fighting the opposition against the terribly flawed tunnels plan, the energy and money would be better spent on plans for desalination plants along the coast of California and water conservation measures.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.</p>
2905	2	Sucking the life out of agriculture (major food producing region) in the north for the benefit of population to the south is certainly a one sided plan. Who will feed our citizens when good fertile land and food producing environment is ruined and made to no longer be able to produce food and crops that help to feed our growing population?	<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>
2905	3	It is not acceptable to ignore the scientific community and the need to protect the local economy and environment. The tunnels are not the greater good.	<p>The comment expresses general opposition to the project on economic and environmental grounds. The best available science was used in the analysis for the EIR/S.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed based on sound science to meet the rigorous standards of the Clean Water Act and federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial. 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>
2906	1	Here in the Bay Area, Save San Francisco Bay has been working hard to restore marshlands and recreate a healthier bay. I cannot imagine, at a time when we are finally reversing past mistakes, you would even consider anything as devastating as the proposed "Water Fix"! What are you thinking?	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
2907	1	Southern California should not be given water at the expense of the environment of Northern California; that is not a sustainable plan - it borders upon corruption.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply) and Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
2908	1	This is a shortsighted, very bad approach to a longstanding issue. The Delta is a rich ecosystem, benefiting mankind and animal creatures. What is happening with exploration of desalination?	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the 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 7 (Desalination).</p>
2909	1	I oppose construction of water tunnels that take water away from the delta near San Francisco Bay.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the 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>
2910	1	Why, do we always have to try to do the impossible? Let Southern California conserve their water down there and stop trying to get more from up here, What happens when they have disrupted the whole state water flow and we end up with destroyed lands up here? Let them conserve their own water and stop jeopardizing the whole state water supply for their excessive resource use. And why is Brown so accommodating to them this time around? Getting old! Get a grip for god's sake!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use in Southern California. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
2911	1	Delta water. It would change the salt flow possibly up to the water fix intakes. This would change the Delta drastically, we don't need it or want it.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The 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>
2912	1	<p>If this is a workable system which will actually help maintain the Delta, can you please make that clear? It doesn't seem to me, after reading through the materials, that this makes any sense.</p> <p>I realize that Southern California is also suffering from drought, but since that seems like a long term situation, shouldn't there be more money spent on doing things like transforming sea water to drinking water, instead of taking the water from Northern California?</p> <p>Is there anyway that you can be sure that those people who are lobbying for these tunnels are actually motivated by what is good for the State rather than what is good for their pocketbook?</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>In the State of California, all water belongs to the people of the state; and water rights are issued as rights to use the water for reasonable and beneficial uses. The proposed project would not affect upstream water rights.</p> <p>For both environmental and economic reasons, there is an urgent need to improve and modernize the existing SWP/CVP conveyance system, which was designed and built decades ago. The ecological problems with the current system could be greatly reduced by the construction and use of new north Delta intake structures with state-of-the-art fish screens. With this future vision in mind, DWR and several state and federal water contractors, in coordination with the Bureau of Reclamation, proposed a strategy for restoring ecological functions in the Delta while improving water supply reliability in California.</p> <p>Since 2006, the BDCP/California WaterFix has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists.</p> <p>The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 37 for a discussion on water needs and Master Response 7 for a discussion on desalination.</p>
2912	1	<p>I totally oppose the water tunnels as they will ruin the waterways, habitat for fish and other animal life, and it robs much-needed water resources from our area.</p> <p>Each city, county, and area of California must only build and develop when the water resources are locally available-or do not build. Do not rob from other areas, which are currently under severe drought, such as the Sacramento area. The people of California should speak up, not shut up! Do not "rob from Peter to pay Paul." Peter then dies.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		I am a California native, and I am disgusted by this plan. Do not build the water tunnels!	operational flexibility. For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
2914	1	Understand we are voting citizens. If this unsustainable plan to steal water and send it south is allowed. you will be responsible for the destruction of the Delta with all that it represents. Damaging one of our state's most needed and necessary water systems is not just foolish, it's damn dangerous. Dangerous to our water system, our wildlife and to us. Put the short term greed factor aside and do the right thing. Stop this horrible, ill planned boondoggle.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. 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.
2915	1	We need conservation and grey water use; not tunnels to move water out of our rivers, estuaries and lakes.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The 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 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. Although conservation components, water storage, 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. Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management, 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.
2916	1	This senior citizen has seen enough "water grabs" in her lifetime, usually benefitting South California at the expense of Northern California's residents- both animal and human. Whoever (some guy, I am sure) had this "good idea" is totally wrong. Stop it 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. Please note that the project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole. Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. Please also refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports/Area of Origin/Water Rights).</p>
2917	1	<p>The extreme pollution from the building of the twin tunnels will supposedly be mitigated by buying credits from another area. What good will this do except put more money into the coffers of the State treasury? The pollution in the Delta will still be there! No mitigation can possibly be offered successfully to those Delta residents who lose the water they now have from their wells, if the massive project commences and the wells are polluted. How can the DWR give them the water they need for daily living, all to send water down to nut trees grown in a desert? The Delta and its residents and its highly productive agricultural economy will pay dearly for this plan.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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/EIS.</p> <p>As described in the EIR/EIS, during construction, slurry walls would be constructed around the construction site at the intakes, tunnel shafts, and forebays to reduce the effect of dewatering wells. Dewatering wells also would be installed at construction sites associated with levees without the use of slurry walls. No dewatering would be required along the tunnel alignment. The effects on groundwater at locations with slurry wall installations would not result in significant effects as compared to Existing Conditions. It is possible, that some impacts may result in effects depending upon specific information that would be collected during design and construction phase. Mitigation measures have been identified in the EIR/EIS to reduce the impacts to less than significant as compared to Existing Conditions. Mitigation Measures AG-1, GW-1, GW-5, and WQ-11 will reduce the severity of significant impacts in agricultural areas by implementing activities such as siting project footprints to encourage continued agricultural production; monitoring changes in groundwater levels during construction; monitoring seepage effects; relocating or replacing agricultural infrastructure in support of continued agricultural activities; identifying, evaluating, developing, and implementing feasible phased actions to reduce EC levels; engaging counties, owners/operators, and other stakeholders in developing optional agricultural stewardship approaches; and/or preserving agricultural land through off-site easements or other agricultural land conservation interests.</p> <p>With respect to offsets, the project will implement Mitigation Measures AQ-1a, 1b, 3a, 3b, 4a, and 4b to offset construction-related nitrogen oxides (NOX) and reactive organic gases (ROG) to net zero. These offsets would be purchased through local air district offset programs or through a DWR-sponsored program. Air district offset programs have operated in California for several decades and have achieved considerable emissions reductions. For example, the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management Districts (SMAQMD) Heavy-Duty Low-Emission Vehicle Incentive Programs (HDLEVIP) awards more than \$7 million annually to emissions reduction projects in the Sacramento Valley. The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District's (SJVAPCD) Voluntary Emission Reduction Agreement (VERA) program has also operated since 1992 and has a proven track record of reducing ozone precursors in the Central Valley.</p> <p>All offsets purchased through Mitigation Measures AQ-1a, 1b, 3a, 3b, 4a, and 4b must achieve a 1:1 reduction with construction emissions to ensure claimed offsets meet the required performance standard. All offsite reductions must also be quantifiable, verifiable, enforceable, and satisfy the basic criterion of additionality (i.e., the reductions would not happen without the financial support of purchased offset</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>credits). These requirements will be outlined in the Mitigation Monitoring Report Protocol (MMRP) and considered a condition of project approval.</p> <p>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 also see response to comment 219-1.</p>
2918	1	Save the Delta for our grandchildren. It is a resource too valuable to destroy.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the 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>
2919	1	I am deeply opposed to putting the financial interests of developers and agri-business over the needs of the environment and all its creatures, including we humans who want it to remain in some sort of natural state. Southern California is in large part a desert, the development of which has for many decades been facilitated by diverting numerous sources of water from their natural courses. With this in mind, if those in power insist on continuing to take water never intended by nature for the purposes to which they wish to put it, they must give up some of their profits so whatever plan is implemented includes provision for protection/restoration of the areas from which water is diverted.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.</p>
2920	1	<p>To divert water from the Delta will further cause irrevocable destruction of productive agricultural land due to salinization.</p> <p>California must build desalination plants for major metropolitan population areas. The cost should be funded by State and Federal taxes.</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>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, and Appendix 8H, Electrical Conductivity, EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Modeling results indicate that the implementation of the water conveyance facilities may positively or adversely affect in-Delta water quality, depending on a number of factors including location, time of year, and hydrologic conditions. See tables in</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Appendices 8E through 8N for specific results related to various water quality constituents (including bromide and chloride).</p> <p>In addition to potential effects associated with the project and alternatives, modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the proposed project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.</p> <p>For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.</p>
2920	2	<p>We must prepare for the future; our grandchildren and their grandchildren.</p> <p>The San Joaquin Valley is the breadbasket of America. The San Joaquin Valley feeds the world. The San Joaquin Valley will lose its ability and title if additional water is diverted from the San Joaquin Delta.</p> <p>The effects will ripple through the world economy. In addition to California's dependence on the multi-billion dollar agriculture industry, national costs for California's produce will drastically increase (supply & demand) if additional land is contaminated by salt water intrusion.</p> <p>A great deal of produce has started to be imported from China and its holdings. China has no Food and Drug Administration. China has demonstrated in past products that substances banned for consumption in the United States are acceptable by China's Standards. That is unacceptable.</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.</p> <p>As described in Impact ECON-6 under Alternative 4A in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, construction of conveyance facilities would convert land from existing agricultural uses to project-related construction uses, and agricultural land could also be affected by changes in water quality and other conditions that would affect crop productivity. These direct effects on agricultural land are described under Impacts AG-1 and AG-2 in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources. Total value of irrigated crop production in the Delta would decline on average by \$5.3 million per year during the construction period, with total irrigated crop acreage declining by about 4,700 acres. Other effects related to production costs, travel time, and loss of investments in production facilities and standing orchards and vineyards would also occur as a result of facilities construction. When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the alternative. As described in Section 14.1.1.4 of Chapter 14, Agriculture, the study area contains 585,000 acres of agricultural land; 4,700 acres would be less than 1% of that land so it is unlikely that prices would increase at a drastic rate. However, because food costs are not a CEQA or NEPA issue, they are not analyzed in this report.</p> <p>As described under Impact AG-2 in Chapter 14, Agriculture, water quality modeling results indicate that it is unlikely that there would be increased frequency of exceedance of agricultural electrical conductivity (salinity) objectives in the western, interior, or southern Delta. However, there could be increased long-term and drought period average EC levels during the summer months in the Sacramento River at Emmaton under Alternative 4A relative to the No Action Alternative (ELT), which could adversely affect agricultural beneficial uses. Implementation of Mitigation Measures AG-1, GW-1, GW-5, and WQ-11 (including Mitigation Measure WQ-11ea) will reduce the severity of these adverse effects.</p>
2921	1	<p>I cannot fathom how easy it is to rape, strip, and desecrate a historic natural environmental treasure like our Delta for agribusiness, and the lack of sustainable water conservation from an all read overpopulated, and careless community of our state! The elephants in the room are Agribusiness Greed, and resource needs because of the overpopulation, and its impacts! If the state can't supply the water they need then pick up, and go somewhere else that can! Rule number 1; you do not set your own house on fire just to stay warm through winter, sooner or later you run out of house! Do we seriously want to suck the life from the entire state to save the interest of business groups, or should new businesses be made that don't affect the houses we live in? If you cannot grow a fruit, or vegetable with limited water, plant cactus! It is a metaphor to find better ways instead of squandering resources on stubbornness, and lack of care for the states environment solely for economics, we haven't tried hard enough, if that is if we have even tried our best at all?</p> <p>We have the potential to be a more resourceful, and modern figure, and role model for the entire nation, but not at the expense of destroying the very land, and creatures we proudly claim are California! If the farmers cannot do it then make the change there, where it is the problem, not with the rest of the state that has its own responsibilities</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project 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
		which are being handled on their own, with modernization, and planning. This impact will be irreversible, and a "uh oh", "we should have", or "I am sorry" will not be able to fix it! Do not curse our state to guaranteed future hardship, without making changes where they belong, and with every possible effort without having to rob Peter to save Paul? I vote no on the tunnels, I do not agree, and I will solidly hold all of those who choose to continue its creation to its disastrous results! No on the tunnels, my choice stands!	
2922	1	<p>The principles this country was founded on, the checks [and] balances, go right out the window when one of the branches of government is under the control of another instead of all working toward a common goal for the states, united. Creating these tunnels will give far too much power to a very exclusive group of people; only their interests will be represented if the elected officials continue to be persuaded by petty campaign donations and promise of political elevation.</p> <p>Whatever lies these tunnels derive from, I am not fooled as to their purpose; these tunnels are to exist to subsidize a very expensive, time-consuming, labor-intensive, counterproductive system that spreads our resources too thin just to make life a little easier for agribusinesses that have it pretty good already.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not provide any evidence as to how the tunnels will adversely impact the Delta ecosystem related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
2922	2	<p>I had hoped that our leadership was one of conviction and purpose, one that could take the mistakes of the past and utilize them to the best of their ability moving forward (hello, pumps? hello, petroleum fire?). When the federal government ties up reserve money in non-renewable resources, it is a very dangerous game (hello, stock market crash?). What happens when the almonds are without fertile soil because of the sediment ripping through the state? Land that is already doing as well as can be expected shouldn't become barren just so that fracking can expand.</p> <p>If frackers want more water, they should pump and treat it themselves with their own tunnels and in their own states. Not mine. Not the one you're supposed to be protecting. Shame on you for letting it get this far; this is going to be absolute anarchy if this is approved. If we no longer have a say in what kind of filth we want in our drinking water, then we really don't have any reason to be proud Americans, now do we?</p>	<p>One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board.</p> <p>The proposed project Lead Agencies have no power to impose penalties on individual water users. DWR and Reclamation have contracts with various entities, some of which sell water to water retailers, who have individual policies and programs to motivate ratepayers to conserve water. Different districts have the right to take different approaches depending on their individual circumstances.</p> <p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows. Fracking - or "hydraulic fracturing" -- presumably could be an "industrial" use of water, and is a lawful use of water. Pursuant to Senate Bill 4 from 2013 (Stats. 2013, Ch.313), moreover, the state Department of Conservation, through its Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR), is currently working on fracking regulations. Please see Master Response 34 for additional information regarding use of water delivered by proposed water conveyance facilities.</p>
2922	3	Focus those millions and billions of taxpayer dollars toward finding a replacement for those resources, more efficient ways of growing, producing, transporting, etc., then you'll solve more than one problem and promote lasting change in the way America does business. Just because you can do this, doesn't mean you ought to. Just because you don't think it will have consequences felt by you, doesn't mean it should be so easy to sell everyone else down the river . . . pun intended.	The commenter does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.
2922	4	Apart from money, we will lose a lot of things that bear no dollar value. The joy of teaching a child how to fish; the thrill of getting a bite from "the big one;" the pride you get from seeing what discarded pumpkin seeds, sun, and a little recycled water can do; the integrity of democracy; the power of voting; the trust we enable you with; a warm	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. Fishing would still be accessible throughout the Delta during construction, although it would be restricted in the direct vicinity of construction areas. Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass, and to Impacts REC-2, 4, 5, and 9 for a discussion of impacts to fishing from the proposed project, as well as Alternative 4A in Chapter

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		shower after a long day; the dream that so many others hope to join us in one day, the American one.	15, Recreation, Impacts REC-3 and 7 regarding boating. For more information regarding Delta as a Place please see Master Response 24.
2922	5	Do your jobs and speak for the people who elected you, not the few that paid you for favors. Because really, if they are to benefit from our hard work, if we're supposed to just throw our taxes at them instead, well, then technically we're the ones paying you to do the job you swore to do. And that's the way it should be. I don't know about you, but to me, California doesn't sound like the place to go if you want to create environmental hazards and toxic wastelands.	The comment does raise any environmental issues 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.
2923	1	You need to build desalination plants in Southern California and use water from the ocean. The north has no water to give you. Go away greedy people.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
2924	1	I live on the Delta and if the tunnels are built my water supply will turn to salt water. If this happens, everything I have worked for my entire life will be lost.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS.
2925	1	I am sure that everyone can agree that the Delta is one of the most important sources of fresh water for Californians across the state. It provides water to several million people as well as agriculture, businesses, and the Delta Ecosystem. Maintaining a healthy Delta Ecosystem is critical to preserving the water quality that so many depend on. The Delta ecosystem has been struggling for many years now due to pollution, water diversions, and crumbling infrastructure. Many plant, animal, and fish species rely on fresh water passing thru the Delta to support a healthy ecosystem. The construction of these massive tunnels at a point upstream of the Delta would significantly reduce the freshwater influx into the Delta that so many species depend and need to support a healthy ecosystem. These tunnels will be able to pull huge amounts of water without any way to verify the quantity being shipped south. The reduction of fresh water flowing thru the Delta will significantly affect salmon, smelt, and various other species that depend on this water. This will surely wreak havoc on an already weakened ecosystem. Scientifically speaking, the tunnels do not make any sense for helping the Delta.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project, Master Response 35 regarding water use in Southern California, Master Response 36 regarding how the proposed project is different from the peripheral canal, and Master Response 5 regarding project funding.
2925	2	The Delta is too important to let an ill-conceived proposal such as these tunnels to be constructed. Little or no information has been presented to the public on the effect of taking huge amounts of fresh water out of the ecosystem. The EIR report released for this was 30,000 pages long! There is no way that anyone can read through or grasp the huge amount of information presented to make a sound public comment. The length and complexity of this document is a clear sign to me that the administration does not want the public to comment on this document. I feel that the people of	The proposed project and the draft BDCP are very complex. The Lead Agencies have attempted to present the analysis in the EIR/EIS in a clear format with an emphasis on information that is useful to the public, agencies, and decisionmakers. Recognizing the length and complexity of the Draft EIR/EIS, the Lead Agencies took steps to make the information accessible and understandable. The Lead Agencies posted online documents highlighting important aspects of the BDCP and the EIR/EIS. They produced 17 narrated informational webinar episodes regarding the BDCP and EIR/EIS that were available online, and they distributed factsheets throughout the comment period. In addition, both the BDCP and EIR/EIS contain executive summaries, and the most complex EIR/EIS chapters contain reader guides. For the RDEIR/SDEIS,

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		California are being ignored and set aside to make way for the decision of a few; a decision that affects the whole state.	the Lead Agencies provided a Document Review Road Map, and Chapter 1 of the RDEIR/SDEIS explains the document's contents. For more information regarding document length and complexity, see Master Response 38. For a discussion of the public comment period, see Master Response 39.
2925	3	<p>The proposed tunnels have already been rejected by voters in 1982, and similar tunnel projects in places like Santa Barbara County have not been cost effective and have provided little benefit to taxpayers. This tunnel proposal is a way for special interests down south to get all the water they want at the expense of the Delta Ecosystem, and at the expense of the tax payers who are being asked to fund this project.</p> <p>These tunnels are unnecessary and will only benefit the few who are pushing for this project to benefit themselves.</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. Please see Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project, Master Response 35 regarding water use in Southern California, Master Response 36 regarding how the proposed project is different from the peripheral canal, and Master Response 5 regarding project funding.</p>
2926	1	<p>As a lifelong resident of California born in 1960, I cut my early political/ecological teeth fighting the ridiculous Southern California water grab that was the "Peripheral Canal", which was championed then by our youngish Governor Brown. Lo and behold, some 40 years later that same much older (Not wiser) Governor Brown is proposing another massive water grab in the guise of the BDCP supported primarily by the Westlands Water District and its large corporate agri-business interests in conjunction with deep pocketed speculative Southern California property developers.</p> <p>The environmental damage the proposed BDCP would cause is overwhelming.</p> <p>It would absolutely devastate the fragile environment of one of the largest remaining estuaries in the U.S. and the vast array of unique and threatened species that it supports.</p> <p>It has been a long time since I have felt so much animus towards a proposed government project but the financial boondoggle that is the BDCP is something I absolutely will not allow to happen on my watch as a native Californian. Foisting this project and its expense on generations of California taxpayers to come for the primary benefit of a limited number of wealthy individuals is a tremendous affront to the fiduciary responsibilities you each hold as government officials.</p> <p>I urge you to stop this ecological and financial disaster known as the BDCP in its current form before it is allowed to progress any further.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>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>Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 36 (Peripheral Canal), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), and Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding).</p>
2927	1	<p>Finding ways of making California water sustainable starts with farming. Eliminating the small number of crops that consume massive amounts of water is a start. Especially those that are grown for export.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via proposed conveyance facilities.</p>
2928	1	<p>The San Francisco Bay estuary is too important too lose. Diverting more water for the south is not the answer. Conservation, drip irrigation and other measures should be used instead. How about water wasters? Let us go after them. Do not kill an ecosystem with millions of people who live around the San Francisco Bay. Do not turn it into an</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		over-salted, polluted, destroyed landscape.	<p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 14 (Salinity) and Master Response 26 (Delta As A Place).</p>
2929	1	It is time to develop our technologies! Develop cost effective desalination and far more efficient use, of what water we already have! We will save more money and construct healthy habitat for all of us creatures.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.</p>
2930	1	The California WaterFix won't! This expensive disaster in the making is the wrong solution for California's water issues. Enhanced local storage, wastewater recycling and better agricultural practices should be our ambition. The tunnels are a terrible idea with grave and costly consequences!	<p>It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Providing regulatory oversight to agribusinesses is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. The Lead Agencies do not have land use planning authorities (such as changing local land uses and zoning ordinances or controlling what crops should be planted).</p> <p>Also, please see Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives, Master Response 3 for information on the project purpose and need, and Master Response 37, which addresses the issue of water storage.</p>
2931	1	I oppose Governor Brown's giant water tunnels, which will drain the life out of the Delta.	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 regarding the proposed project's Purpose and Need.</p>
2931	2	<p>For years Governor Brown has promised that the BDCP (aka Delta Giant Tunnels) would be a "habitat conservation plan," that it would meet the "gold standard" for protection of the Delta by restoring tens of thousands of acres of marine habitat and restoring natural Delta flows. Now, suddenly, all that has been abandoned and the name has been changed to "WaterFix," with no habitat restoration or protections for the Delta -- just the giant Delta-killing water tunnels.</p> <p>You can't change the rules at the last minute and shove these giant tunnels down our throats whether we like it or not. The governor must begin the process all over again</p>	<p>Alternative 4A, also known as California WaterFix, has been developed in response to public and agency input and is the new CEQA Preferred Alternative. Alternative 4A is also the NEPA Preferred Alternative, a designation that was not attached to any of the alternatives presented in the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS. Alternative 4 remains a potentially viable alternative and is being carried forward in this RDEIR/SDEIS because it represents the original habitat conservation plan/natural community conservation plan (HCP/NCCP) alternative approach, and because it provides an important reference point from which the Alternative 4A, 2D, and 5A descriptions and analyses were developed. If the Lead Agencies ultimately choose the alternative implementation strategy and select an alternative presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS after</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		and consider real solutions to California's water woes and the Delta's ecological decline.	<p>completing the CEQA and NEPA processes, elements of the conservation plan contained in the alternatives in the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS may be utilized by other programs for implementation of the long term conservation efforts.</p> <p>The primary parallel habitat restoration program is called California EcoRestore (EcoRestore), which will be overseen by the California Resources Agency and implemented under the California Water Action Plan.</p>
2931	3	Solutions must include conservation, desalinization, water storage facilities, and reduced reliance on the Delta as a source of water supply. There is no excuse for turning a blind eye to these alternatives and instead adopting the Governor's multi-billion dollar water grab.	<p>The proposed project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies needed to meet California's overall water management needs. It is not a substitute for increased commitments to other water supply solutions, including recycling, desalination, water conservation and storage. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please refer to Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives and compliance with CEQA and NEPA and the Delta Reform Act. Also, see Master Response 7 for information on desalination and why it was not included as a project alternative.</p> <p>It is important to 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 plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented California Waterfix project would be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Please refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports/Area of Origin/Water Rights).</p>
2931	4	<p>These mega-tunnels can drain 9,000 cubic feet per second from the Sacramento River. That is over half the flow of the river in the summer months of a non-drought year.</p> <p>If any new tunnels or canal were ever to be built, the capacity should be absolutely no more than 3,000 cubic feet per second.</p>	<p>Operation of the project water delivery system could not drain the Delta rivers and channels dry, including the Sacramento River. 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 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. 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.</p> <p>The RDEIR/SDEIS and Final EIR/EIS presents analysis of Alternative 5A which describes north Delta diversion facilities with one intake and 3,000 cfs diversion capacity. Please refer to Section 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS.</p>
2931	5	<p>This process has been dishonest from the beginning. It has always been a huge water grab dressed up as a "save the Delta" plan. The "Fix" was in from the very beginning.</p> <p>The Governor told critics of his tunnels to "shut up" as he spoke to his buddies, the water contractors who profit from the tunnels. How dare you address the public that way? This shows there has never been any willingness to consider real alternatives to the tunnels, like storage, conservation, desalinization, and restoring Delta flows.</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 the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish 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, Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage.
2931	6	<p>Currently, without the tunnels, up to 65% of the water that flows into the Delta may be exported during large periods of the year. That leaves only 35% of natural flows in the Delta. We don't need tunnels to export more water.</p> <p>The best Delta scientists recommend that 75% of the natural flow of water into the Delta should be maintained, leaving up to 25% available for export and diversion. That makes sense. The process must start over with the aim of meeting the goal of 75% of natural flow. It can be done.</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. Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high to improve Delta conditions for aquatic resources.</p> <p>As described in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives Conservation Measure 1, of the EIR/EIS, one of the potential alternatives considered was based upon the State Water Resources Control Board 2010 Development of Flow Criteria for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Ecosystem, which described providing up to 75 percent of unimpaired flow into the Delta to improve aquatic resources habitat conditions. This potential alternative was not evaluated in detail because the flow recommendations in the 2010 report could not be achieved without adverse impacts to cold water management for fisheries in the Sacramento, Feather, and American rivers without reductions in non-SWP and non-CVP water rights diversions. The Purpose and Need of this EIR/EIS would not allow changes to non-SWP and non-CVP water rights. However, Alternatives 7 and 8 in the EIR/EIS reflect similar flow criteria in a manner that would only affect SWP and CVP water rights.</p>
2931	7	Governor Brown, the only possible alternative that you have put on the table is the No Project Alternative. At this point it is the only honest choice. Roll up your sleeves, get to work on real solutions, and lay this dishonest water tunnel plan to rest.	<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. See Master Response 4 regarding the development of alternatives.</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 the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
2931	8	We have been complaining for years that the tunnels can drain too much water from the Delta (as the pumping has for years). The plan points to "adaptive management" but the Independent Science Board recently slammed the California WaterFix Adaptive Management Plan. The state keeps saying, "Trust us. We'll manage the tunnels appropriately and will not take more water than we should." Yet, for ten or more years the state has extracted more water than the system could support, causing the salmon and other fish populations to crash.	<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>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods. See Mater Response 26 regarding effects to upstream water users and Master Response 28 regarding operational criteria for the proposed project.
2931	9	During the drought, the state moved way too much water from the north to the south and now the reservoirs in the north are at their lowest points ever, threatening community drinking water and upstream salmon hatcheries while Los Angeles's Pyramid Reservoir (filled with Delta water) is still full.	See response to comment 2937-8 regarding operations of the proposed project. 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 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. See Master Response 47 regarding drought and California Waterfix.
2931	10	The plan fails to recognize the importance of the Delta as a recreational area. The Delta should be made a National Recreation Site. It is unique and special. Yet boating is nearly completely ignored. Studies do not effectively analyze the effect on boating communities, nor on boating recreational areas.	Impacts to boating are discussed in Chapter 15, Impacts REC-3 and 7, of the Final EIR/EIS.
2931	11	The effect of the plan on the economies of Delta communities is understated.	Under Alternative 4A, additional regional employment and income could create net positive effects on the character of Delta communities. 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 in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics.
2931	12	If you are so sure about your recent California WaterFix poll, why don't you put it on the ballot and let the voters decide? No tunnels.	Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. The documentation generated by this proposed project has undergone extensive public and scientific input, discussion, and transparency, including the posting of administrative draft chapters online and providing many more opportunities for public participation than is normally required by the CEQA/NEPA processes (see Master Response 41 regarding transparency.
2932	1	My family owns property on Long Island located on the Sacramento River, across from Isleton. We have seen the results of the current lack of run off from the drought, increased river bottom weeds and water hyacinth. This plan will destroy the water quality and the ecosystem of the Sacramento River, Delta and San Francisco Bay.	For information on how the project could affect aquatic weeds, fish, and wildlife, please see Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Species, and Chapter 12, Terrestrial Biological Resources. For information on how the project could affect water quality, please see Chapter 8 Water Quality.
2932	2	As a resident and registered voter of California, I demand that the Twin Tunnels plan be rejected. We need instead to bring together experts in all relevant fields to develop a plan that really does address California's water problems going forward, and does so in ways that conserve our financial resources and protect our wildlife, water quality, and environment.	Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. 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 allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			the purpose and need behind the proposed project.
2932	3	The Twin Tunnels will cost the public about \$40-\$50 Billion and not create any new water.	The project would cost approximately \$15 billion. Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on the costs of project implementation.
2932	4	The original version of the Twin Tunnels plan--the Bay Delta Conservation Plan--was rejected last fall by the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Environmental Protection Agency. These and other federal agencies criticized the application's faulty science and fuzzy economics. Instead of modifying the plan, the Governor has stripped out almost all funds for mitigation of damage and has re-submitted the same Twin Tunnels plan under a new name.	To review responses to comments submitted by federal agencies during the 2013 or 2015 comment periods, please refer to the index of commenter's to find the appropriate letter number(s).The commenter correctly notes that the State and Federal agencies proposed a new sub-alternative -- Alternative 4A -- which would replace Alternative 4 (the proposed BDCP) as the State's proposed project in 2015. Alternative 4A reflects the state's proposal to separate the conveyance facility and habitat restoration measures into two separate efforts: California WaterFix and California EcoRestore. These two efforts are a direct reflection of public comments and fulfill the requirement of the 2009 Delta Reform Act to meet co-equal goals.
2932	5	The Twin Tunnels will have the capacity to take in more than 100% of the current average flow of the Sacramento River, potentially stopping all freshwater flow into San Francisco Bay. Most of the diverted water will be delivered to unsustainable orchards in southern San Joaquin County.	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. See Master Response 3 regarding the Purpose and Need of the proposed project and 28 regarding operations.
2932	6	The Twin Tunnels will have the capacity to take in more than 100% of the current average flow of the Sacramento River, potentially stopping all freshwater flow into San Francisco Bay. Most of the diverted water will be delivered to unsustainable orchards in southern San Joaquin County.	See response to comment 2932-6 regarding operations of the proposed project.
2932	7	Likely environmental results of the Twin Tunnels project are the collapse of the Sacramento-San Joaquin-San Francisco Bay ecosystem, elimination of salmon and most other native fish species, reduction of endangered bird populations, periodic toxicity of shellfish, massive fish kills in San Francisco Bay, weeds and stagnant water along shorelines, and permanent disruption of offshore ecology.	Chapters 11 and 12 Final EIR/EIS describe the project's expected effects, based on the best available data. In addition, both chapters present measures that would avoid, minimize, and compensate for significant impacts.
2932	8	Predictable economic outcomes of the Twin Tunnels include severe effects on San Francisco's tourist and convention industries; a loss of appeal for the Bay Area as a site for new business location; a reduction of property values in communities near waterways; and an end to farming, sport fishing, and seasonal work in the Delta, Stockton, and adjacent areas of the Sacramento Valley. Please stop the Twin Tunnels!	Please refer to Impact ECON-13, 4, 5 and 6 under Alternative 4A, the Preferred Alternative, in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics. As discussed under Impact ECON-1, construction of the water conveyance facilities would be anticipated to result in a net temporary increase of income and employment in the Delta region. Construction-related employment from the project is estimated to peak at 2,427 FTE jobs in year 3. Total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) would peak in year 12, at 8,673 FTE jobs. Direct agricultural employment would be reduced by an estimated 16 FTE jobs, while total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) associated with agricultural employment would fall by 57 FTE jobs. Throughout the five-county Delta region, population and employment would expand as a result of the construction of water conveyance facilities, as discussed under Impacts ECON-1 and ECON-2. Under Alternative 4A, additional regional employment and income could create net positive effects on the character of Delta communities. San Francisco is not within the proposed project footprint; therefore, no socioeconomic effects are expected to San Francisco or the Bay area. Additionally, the Delta encompasses a large area. While fishing would be reduced at select locations during construction, it would not be reduced in the Delta as a whole. Please refer to Impact REC-4 under Alternative 4A in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			measures, the project would result in a less-than-significant impact on recreational fishing opportunities.
2933	1	These comments are provided in response to the 2015 Public Review of the RDEIR/SDEIS, hereafter document. Due to the length of the document as well as the BDCP, I have not been afforded sufficient time to review and comment as I'd like.	<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> <p>As explained in Master Response 39, the public review period for the RDEIR/SDEIS was 105 days, which is more than double the typical 45-day review period under CEQA and NEPA. Moreover, the BDCP itself was available for review beginning on December 14, 2013, more than a year and a half before the RDEIR/SDEIS comment period closed.</p>
2933	2	As expressed in previous comments on the BDCP the document [RDEIR/SDEIS] provides little evidence that the new alternatives will provide a long-term solution to address water consumption and environmental needs. Specifically, the proposed actions further the short-sighted nature of public policy and environmental management dating back to the beginning of the State of California. Construction of the proposed tunnels will sell short the opportunities for a real solution to balancing water and environmental concerns in the Delta, and will rob future generations the right to inherit a world in as good or better condition than nature intended.	<p>More than two-thirds of the residents of the state and more than two million acres of highly productive farm land receive water exported from the Delta watershed. The proposed project aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. However, the Lead Agencies have no authority to designate what water is used for.</p> <p>One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board.</p> <p>The proposed project Lead Agencies have no power to impose penalties on individual water users. DWR and Reclamation have contracts with various entities, some of which sell water to water retailers, who have individual policies and programs to motivate ratepayers to conserve water. Different districts have the right to take different approaches depending on their individual circumstances. See Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 34 for additional details on the determination of beneficial use.</p> <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>
2933	3	Where are the real solutions that seek to meet sustainable demands on water through water recycling, building design focused on rainwater capture, smart land use planning, arid agricultural land retirement, water policy reform, and ecological restoration focused on intervention actions? While politically these may not be popular, one thing we have seen through the current drought is a willingness to be innovative beyond a mentality that California's water supply is linked solely to an outdated Central Valley Project and State Water Project concept. The document [RDEIR/SDEIS] and BDCP fail to recognize the holistic view of the Delta beginning at the sources, which feed into it. The Delta is part of a landscape from summit to sea, and the problems within the Delta are not exclusive to its legal boundary.	<p>Appendix 1C of the Final EIR/EIS, Demand Management Measures, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. Refer to Master Response 6 for more information on demand management. Although components such as desalination plants and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the State, they are beyond the scope of the project.</p> <p>See response to comment 2933-2 regarding beneficial use of water.</p>
2933	4	1-3 It is alarming that such a limited proportion of the state's population provided comments given the significance of the project to the people and environment.	See response to comment 2933-1 regarding public outreach.
2933	5	1-4 NMFS and FWS also need to uphold their Trust responsibilities to Tribes pursuant to PL-93-638. Furthermore, there is no mention of PL 93-638 and other trust	Please see Master Response 21 regarding tribal issues. Additionally, Chapter 18, Cultural Resources, describes the coordination efforts made through the release of the RDEIR/SDEIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		responsibilities for federal agencies. Further there is no discussion of CDFG Code 16000, which supports Tribal interests in Trust resources.	
2933	6	1-7 In no way is a created system that is by no means complementary to nature's design sustainable. Delta Ecosystem Health and Productivity. Herein lies the problem. The ecosystem cannot exist without a dynamic system. And under this plan there is no intent to restore anything, but where is that stated?	The proposed project was developed to meet the standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 45 (Purpose and Need).
2933	7	1-11 In acknowledging the influx of sea water, how will locating the tunnels in their planned location alleviate this, and what will further sea level rise (realistically, not to what is modelled here) do to exacerbate this?	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. Effects of the alternatives on salinity levels are described in Chapter 8, Water Quality, and Appendix 8H, Electrical Conductivity, EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Modeling results indicate that the implementation of the water conveyance facilities will have different effects 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 EC, bromide, and chloride). 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.
2933	8	1-13 The Endangered Species Act also states that federal agencies should use their authority to recover species. How is BOR contributing to recovery when they are operating a system that runs counter to nature?	As described in the EIR/EIS and Draft BDCP, the conservation strategy for recovery of species included a combination of improved water supply conveyance conditions, Delta restoration, enhancement and protection and reduction of other ecological stressors. 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 the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 45 (Purpose and Need).
2933	9	1-35 Additional Discussion of Climate Change. It is important to note that the assumptions do not adequately account for sea level rise and other attributes of climate change. The plan does nothing to consider how to make the Delta resilient to climate change. In pre-European times the Delta was dynamic and resilient. It has undergone sea level rise until levees were built.	It is not clear what the commenter means by "assumptions do not adequately account for sea level rise and other attributes of climate change", no specific suggestions are provided for alternative assumptions that should have been made or scientific evidence that the assumptions that have been made about future conditions are flawed. Please refer to Chapter 29 (Climate Change) in the Final EIR/EIS which specifically discusses the impact of the action alternatives on climate change, how the impacts of the action alternatives for each resource will be affected by climate change, and how the action alternatives will affect the resiliency and adaptability of the Plan Area to the effects of climate change.
2933	10	2-14 Continued reliance on water from the Delta without significant and meaningful restoration to resiliency regardless of the alternative will continue to strain the ecosystem. The human-caused adverse changes to the Delta and contributing watersheds that will perpetuate as a direct, indirect and cumulative impact are thus not	The EIR/EIS evaluates changes of the implementation of the proposed project and other action alternatives as compared to the Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative. As under the Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative, the proposed project and action alternatives would continue to only export water from the Delta under existing water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board to DWR and Reclamation for the CVP and SWP. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		less than significant.	in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. 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 Final EIR/EIS.
2933	11	2-17 In consideration of emissions, where is the analysis of the growth inducing impacts associated with conveyance of Delta waters. Really the analysis here is global in scope considering the export of commodities.	Chapter 30 provides the growth inducing analysis of the increased water supply reliability that would be provided by WaterFix in each California hydrologic region.
2933	12	3-2 Construction of pumping facilities and other modifications to Clifton Court Forebay. It is highly likely any proposed actions in this area will impact traditional cultural properties. Certainly the areas identified for the pumping plant have been used for collection of cultural resources used to make baskets and regalia as well as other cultural purposes. Amongst some of the resources collected from this area by my family members are yellow willow, sandbar willow, stinging nettle, creeping wild rye, California hibiscus, dogbane, and many others. As such, the use of this area for this purpose designates it a traditional cultural property. Additionally, numerous species of culturally important fish and wildlife are known from this area. The document and BDCP fail to adequately address the specific impacts to these species of cultural significance not limited to the areas near Clifton Court Forebay. Impacts to these areas would adversely affect the traditional cultural property. Pursuant to PL-93-638 BOR is required to uphold its Tribal trust responsibilities. Where and what is the footprint of this site on Granville Tract? 4.1-4 see comment for 3-2	This comment regarding Section 106 consultation was addressed in the Recirculated DEIR/S through the addition of Section 18.2.1.3, which provides information on Section 106 consultation and development of a Programmatic Agreement as part of a phased approach to identifying cultural resources. Sensitivity assessments also address impacts to unknown (or unevaluated) cultural resources. For additional information about Native American outreach efforts, including identification and analysis of impacts on archaeological sites, Traditional Cultural Properties, and cultural significance of biological resources, please see Master Response 48.
2933	13	Figure 3.2-1 What are the power sources? This project should include development of its own sustainable power. Elsewhere solar panels have been placed over canals to provide power while also minimizing evaporation. Clearly this should be considered here.	See section 3.6.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS for a discussion of the powers supply related to the proposed project. Cover canals with solar panels is outside the scope of the proposed project.
2933	14	3-9 Cultural resources does not address traditional cultural properties or traditional cultural landscapes. It is recommended that the project proponents provide funding to appropriate traditional cultural practitioners of this region to complete a study of these features.	See response to comment 2933-12 regarding Traditional Cultural Properties.
2933	15	4.1-1 The reduction in mitigation is not providing any benefits to the functions and services the Delta provides. This seems to be cutting corners to get the tunnels built while punting the issue of fish, wildlife and plants off to another plan. Any lands set aside for mitigation should be placed in trust to a Tribal organization whose members have ancestral ties to the Delta.	Although Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A include only those habitat restoration measures needed to provide mitigation for specific regulatory compliance purposes, habitat restoration is still recognized as a critical component of the state's long-term plans for the Delta. Such larger endeavors, however, will likely be implemented over time under actions separate and apart from these alternatives. The primary parallel habitat restoration program is called California EcoRestore (EcoRestore), which will be overseen by the California Resources Agency and implemented under the California Water Action Plan. Additional priority restoration projects will be identified through regional and likely locally-led planning processes facilitated by the Delta Conservancy. Plans will be completed for the Cache Slough, West Delta, Cosumnes, and South Delta. Planning for the Suisun Marsh region is already complete and a process for

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			integrated planning in the Yolo Bypass is underway. The Delta Conservancy will likely lead the implementation of identified restoration projects, in collaboration with local governments and with a priority on using public lands in the Delta.
2933	16	4.1-2 The intakes are still located within the current range of tidal flux and seawater intrusion. The plan only accounts for a conservative model for sea-level rise and subsequent seawater intrusion. How is this solving any water problem. The models should use the worst case scenario.	See Master Response 19 regarding climate change and sea level rise projections used for the proposed project.
2933	17	The planning is short-sighted with respect to the time period of analysis. The CVP has existed for longer than this plan is considering. Removing restoration from this plan and deferring to California EcoRestore is piecemeal. California EcoRestore is not adding much new to the region that doesn't already exist. Many of these areas are already protected, and the agencies managing them have limited success in fulfilling their Trust obligations to restore these lands and fund management thereof. California EcoRestore proposes only 30,000 acres of restoration/enhancement whereas BDCP initially proposed approximately 65,000 acres. Less is not more for a functional ecosystem.	<p>In the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS, a new No Action Alternative was considered since Alternatives 4A, 2D and 5A were no longer seeking 50-year permit terms. In response to comments received during the 2013-2014 public comment period, the new No Action Alternative baseline examines conditions at 2025 due to the levels of uncertainty regarding both the future effects of climate change and the long-term effectiveness of habitat restoration in recovering fish populations.</p> <p>The EIR/S has indicated an indefinite project life. Once major infrastructure is constructed, the long term use of the facility is not totally predicated on a design life. It is recognized that parts of the facility may require rehabilitation; however, it is likely that the facility would continue to operate for the indefinite future. The effects analysis has conducted analyses at multiple time frames that are well within the timeframe of what would normally be considered a "design life". The EIR/S has disclosed that there are multiple uncertainties at the later stages associated with climate change and the habitat restoration and qualitatively assessed those effects to the extent of the best available science at this time. This is a very conservative approach to disclosing the effects of the project. For more information regarding the permit term please see Master Response 45.</p> <p>Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. However, a modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) also is being considered. Alternative 4A reflects the state's proposal to separate the conveyance facility and habitat restoration measures into two separate efforts: California WaterFix and California EcoRestore.</p> <p>Under the revised approach, the Proposed Action includes habitat restoration as necessary to mitigate significant environmental effects and satisfy applicable ESA and CESA standards. Programs for long-term conservation efforts for species recovery separate from the Proposed Action would be addressed by other state and federal programs as part of California EcoRestore. Under EcoRestore, the state will pursue restoration of more than 30,000 acres of fish and wildlife habitat by 2020. The RDEIR/SDEIS analysis considers restoration actions that are independent of Proposed Action, such as EcoRestore, as part of the cumulative impact analysis. For more information regarding how the project was evaluated as a whole, please see Master Response 8.</p>
2933	18	4.1-5 How is it that an HCP is not required under the new alternatives, but is necessary under the other alternatives? This needs to be explained.	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. It should be noted, however, that alternatives involving a HCP are still viable alternatives. Please see Master Response 5 regarding the BDCP.
2933	19	4.1-7 (Table 4.1-2) While CFS is good for understanding hydrology and fisheries needs, the layperson would benefit from knowing what percent of flow and what the equivalent acre feet allocation would be under these scenarios.	The table referred to in this comment includes the capacity assumptions for the Delta intakes. The assumptions for the proposed project and the action alternatives do not include specific allocations for any water users. The water deliveries are calculated using the CALSIM II model using assumptions related to existing federal and state regulatory requirements (such as SWRCB Decision 1641 and other water rights criteria) and proposed regulatory requirements (such as North Delta Bypass Flows that would require a percentage of flow to remain in the Sacramento River downstream of the north Delta diversions as described in Chapter 3 of the EIR/EIS). The amount of SWP and CVP water deliveries that would occur under each action alternative as compared to the Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative are presented in

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Chapter 5 and Appendix 5A, Section C, of the EIR/EIS.
2933	20	4.1-15 Deferring the conservation actions to other requirements and initiatives described is piecemeal.	See response to comment 2933-17 regarding why the development of EcoRestore. Also refer to Master Response 2, 4 and 46.
2933	21	4.1-20 Do not burden existing resources with the responsibility to monitor the outcomes of this project. Funding to monitor and manage in perpetuity needs to be provided by the project proponents through other sources. Who would be involved in collaborative science. The term suggests only like-minded individuals and organizations would be involved.	The updated Collaborative Science and Adaptive Management and Monitoring Program has been updated in this Final EIR/EIS. Please refer also to Master Response 33, which addresses adaptive management and monitoring.
2933	22	4.1-38 The list of species is too limited, and this was a problem in the BDCP too. Where is the consideration of species impacted via direct, indirect and cumulative impacts. The list of species impacted by the CVP is more comprehensive.	The commenter states the list of species considered is too limited and refers specifically to page 4.1-38 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. The table that starts on this page is Table 4.1-8. Terrestrial Biology Resource Restoration and Protection Principles for Implementing Environmental Commitments, which lists further guidelines for implementing the environmental commitments (in the context of the Draft BDCP, these were often characterized as biological goals and objectives) and is not intended as a list of all species addressed in the EIR/EIS. A list of species addressed in the EIR/EIS can be found in Section 12.1.3 Special Status Species. No change to the EIR/EIS is necessary based on this comment.
2933	23	4.2-12 Effects on sea level change Section 6.3.1.1 could not be found.	See Master Response 19 and Chapter 29 of the EIR/EIS, regarding climate change and sea level rise
2933	24	Fig 28-1 Percent minority. This map illustrates census block data. Further analysis needs to be completed to document how the proposed alternatives impact this landscape from a Native American perspective. The point is that California lacks treaties ceding this land, waters and "resources" to the Federal, state and local governments. Thus, these lands are all within Tribal jurisdiction, and as such this project poses a significant environmental justice issue. In fact, this is a traditional cultural landscape, which has yet to be analyzed by the project proponents. In review of Fig 4.1-1 there are several areas of impacts identified for tunnel material placement or forebays, which are culturally significant or have culturally significant properties.	See response to comment 2933-12 regarding Traditional Cultural Properties.
2933	25	I still support the no action alternative, and hope the project proponents will develop a meaningful plan to restore resiliency to the Delta and surrounding landscape.	<p>Since the late 1800s, the Bay-Delta ecosystem has been substantially altered. Changes in key environmental attributes of the Bay-Delta have contributed to the current degraded state of the ecosystem and appear to be proximate causes of declines in desired fishes and increases in non-native species. California WaterFix is not intended to address all the factors that have contributed to the Delta's decline and briefly summarizes a few but not all of those factors. Many factors that have contributed to the decline of the Delta's ecosystem including the conversion of tidal marsh and floodplains to farmland, construction of levees and altering of tide flows, in-Delta and upstream water diversions, contaminant discharges, ammonia and nutrient discharges and changes to the food web, increases in water temperatures, and introduction of non-native and invasive species. The Delta will remain in a highly altered state for the foreseeable future and the project is not intended to address all the past harms or restore the Delta to a pre-altered state.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. 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.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Responses 4 (Alternatives), and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
2934	1	<p>I am opposed to the Delta Tunnels because:</p> <p>The benefits do not match the cost. According to Dr. Jeff Michael, University of the Pacific, the estimated benefits for the project drop by \$10 billion without regulatory assurance for water deliveries so that costs EXCEED benefits by at least \$8 billion. The costs will be borne by farmers and urban ratepayers. Since there is no added water, urban ratepayers obtain no benefit.</p>	<p>Water delivered to the SWP and CVP water contractors participating in proposed project would be within the existing contract amounts. 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>Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on costs and benefits of project implementation.</p>
2934	2	<p>I am opposed to the Delta Tunnels because:</p> <p>The rural and urban rate payers should be notified of the expected rate increases and vote approval, like any tax increase.</p>	<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 vary 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 information regarding funding of the proposed project.</p>
2934	3	<p>I am opposed to the Delta Tunnels because:</p> <p>If farmers must pay for more costly water, they have stated they will need to convert to profitable crops like almonds to ship to Asia. Californians will not have fresh produce on their own tables.</p>	<p>The proposed project does not make determinations regarding how water conveyed through the proposed project, California Aqueduct, Delta Mendota Canal, or other water conveyance facilities is put to a beneficial use. Contractors and their customers must make economic decisions about planting in light of the amounts of water they are likely to receive going forward. With regards to beneficial use of water, please see Master Response 34.</p>
2934	4	<p>I am opposed to the Delta Tunnels because:</p> <p>The tunnels do not provide for any additional water in a drought after prior water rights and public trust needs are met. During many years, they are likely to be dry. Other alternatives do produce more water.</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> <p>See response to comment 2934-1 regarding reliable water supply.</p>
2934	5	<p>I am opposed to the Delta Tunnels because:</p> <p>The California WaterFix does not help reduce reliance on Delta imports as mandated by the 2009 Delta Reform Act.</p>	<p>Under the range of alternatives considered in the EIR/S full contract amounts are not delivered in the majority of times to the SWP and CVP water contractors, as presented in Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Model Results, of the EIR/EIS. Long-term water deliveries to SWP and CVP water contractors located south of the Delta are lower under Alternatives 6, 7, and 8 as compared to the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative. The EIR/S was prepared in a manner to comply with the 2009 Delta Reform Act, as described in Appendix 3I, BDCP Compliance with the 2009 Delta Reform Act, of the Final EIR/EIS and Appendix 3J, Alternative 4A (Proposed Project) Compliance with the 2009 Delta Reform Act.</p> <p>The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. It is important</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).
2934	6	<p>I am opposed to the Delta Tunnels because:</p> <p>San Francisco Bay-Delta business, tourism, fishing, and farming communities cannot trust that the tunnels will be operated in a manner to protect our interest, especially because the State Water Resources Control Board, the Department of Water Resources, and the Bureau of Reclamation have allowed for the waiving and weakening of Delta water quality standards and species protections during the drought, endangering numerous Delta species and bringing some to the precipice of extinction.</p>	Please Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need. The ecological problems with the current system could be greatly reduced by the construction and use of new north Delta intake structures with state-of-the-art fish screens. With this future vision in mind, DWR and several State and federal water contractors, in coordination with Reclamation, proposed a strategy for restoring ecological functions in the Delta while improving water supply reliability in California. 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 limited but substantial amounts of habitat restoration, as necessary to mitigate significant environmental effects and satisfy applicable ESA and CESA standards.
2934	7	<p>I am opposed to the Delta Tunnels because:</p> <p>The California EcoRestore is not part of the California WaterFix. Hence the California WaterFix does not meet the coequal goals required by the 2009 Delta Reform Act. Even if the EcoRestore were included, it does little more than meet the existing mitigation for prior damage, and does not mitigate for the new damage that will be caused by tunnel construction and by removing water that otherwise would flow through Delta.</p>	<p>Although Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A include only those habitat restoration measures needed to provide mitigation for specific regulatory compliance purposes, habitat restoration is still recognized as a critical component of the state's long-term plans for the Delta. Such larger endeavors, however, will likely be implemented over time under actions separate and apart from these alternatives. The primary parallel habitat restoration program is called California EcoRestore (EcoRestore), which will be overseen by the California Resources Agency and implemented under the California Water Action Plan. Proposition 1 funds and other state and public dollars will be directed exclusively for public benefits unassociated with any regulatory compliance responsibilities.</p> <p>The primary objective of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to disclose to decision makers the environmental impacts of a proposed action and alternatives, evaluating the potential adverse change to existing conditions and determining if mitigation is available to offset the potential impact. These documents, along with many others developed through the project planning (e.g., engineering, economic, and other technical studies and other environmental compliance processes (e.g., Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, and water rights compliance), will serve as the basis for DWR and other agencies' decision on whether to approve the project. The Federal and State Lead Agencies have done their best to make the EIR/EIS for the proposed project as fair, objective, and complete as possible and believe the scope of the project and the analysis contained in each chapter sufficiently discloses the potential impacts associated with each of the action alternatives. The EIR/S and the RDEIR/SDEIS identify environmental commitments, avoidance and minimization measures, and mitigation measures to reduce or avoid effects. Specific mitigation measures are proposed when necessary to avoid, reduce, minimize, or compensate for adverse environmental effects of the action alternatives. Mitigation is also presented to meet CEQA's specific requirement that whenever possible, agency decision makers adopt feasible mitigation available to reduce a project's significant impacts to a less-than-significant level. Although NEPA does not impose a similar procedural obligation on federal agencies, this practice is consistent with NEPA's intent that mitigation be discussed in sufficient detail to ensure that environmental consequences have been fairly evaluated. Under Section 10 of the ESA, an applicant must minimize and mitigate the impacts of the taking of listed species, to the maximum extent practicable. Mitigation measures included in the EIR/EIS are considered to be potentially feasible; however, the ultimate determination of feasibility can be made only by state and federal lead agency decision makers. For more information regarding significant and unavoidable impacts please see Master Response 10.</p> <p>As the lead agency under CEQA and NEPA, DWR and Reclamation are responsible for implementing the</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>EIR/EIS mitigation measures and monitoring their success. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan for the BDCP/California WaterFix EIR/EIS includes additional information regarding the commenters concerns regarding mitigation. Master Response 22 provides additional information regarding mitigation, environmental commitments, avoidance and minimization measures and Alternative-specific environmental commitments.</p> <p>See response to comment 2934-1 regarding the water delivered under 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>
2934	8	<p>I am opposed to the Delta Tunnels because:</p> <p>The route selected is the worst alternative that could be selected since it does not protect Delta farm communities and Delta recreation as required by the 2009 Delta Reform Act. It is only the cheapest. A construction project through the heart of the Delta, through the sensitive estuary and loud pounding through bird habitats for years is not the way to protect the fish or fowl. Instead, the alternative to route the tunnels far east, by I-5, should replace the current route.</p>	<p>The purpose of the proposed project's EIR/EIS is to analyze the impacts of the alternatives on the environment under the legal framework of NEPA and CEQA. The analysis covers 26 resource areas within the plan area. The impacts from construction activities and proposed mitigation measures are discussed across all resource chapters including Chapter 14, Agricultural, and Chapter 15, Recreation..</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 4 regarding alternatives development and Master Response 10 regarding Delta Reform Compliance).</p>
2934	9	<p>I am opposed to the Delta Tunnels because:</p> <p>Construction plans include de-watering Delta farmers' wells for years, making farming and living in their homes not possible. Yet there is no provision to provide remuneration to them.</p>	<p>As described in the EIR/EIS, during construction, slurry walls would be constructed around the construction site at the intakes, tunnel shafts, and forebays to reduce the effect of dewatering wells. Dewatering wells also would be installed at construction sites associated with levees without the use of slurry walls. No dewatering would be required along the tunnel alignment. The effects on groundwater at locations with slurry wall installations would not result in significant effects as compared to Existing Conditions. It is possible, that some impacts may result in effects depending upon specific information that would be collected during design and construction phase. Mitigation measures have been identified in the EIR/EIS to reduce the impacts to less than significant as compared to Existing Conditions. Mitigation Measures AG-1, GW-1, GW-5, and WQ-11 will reduce the severity of significant impacts in agricultural areas by implementing activities such as siting project footprints to encourage continued agricultural production; monitoring changes in groundwater levels during construction; monitoring seepage effects; relocating or replacing agricultural infrastructure in support of continued agricultural activities; identifying, evaluating, developing, and implementing feasible phased actions to reduce EC levels; engaging counties, owners/operators, and other stakeholders in developing optional agricultural stewardship approaches; and/or preserving agricultural land through off-site easements or other agricultural land conservation interests.</p>
2934	10	<p>I am opposed to the Delta Tunnels because:</p> <p>Barges and construction for years through recreational waterways is not the way to protect Delta recreation. The route to save the estuary would be to route the tunnels far East, by I-5.</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response 4 regarding selection of alternatives. Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a would reduce impacts on marine navigation by development and implementation of site-specific construction traffic management plans, including specific measures related to management of barges and stipulations to notify the commercial and leisure boating communities of proposed barge operations in the waterways.</p>
2935	1	<p>I strongly oppose the Delta Tunnels. They will not produce more water or more reliable supplies.</p>	<p>Water delivered to the SWP and CVP water contractors participating in proposed project would be within the existing contract amounts. 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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
2935	2	Although the tunnel plan is called the Bay Delta Conservation Plan, it would destroy the Delta, the largest estuary on the coast of North and South America and home to critical habitat.	The proposed project was developed to meet the standards of the federal and State Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response4 regarding the Purpose and Need of the project.
2935	3	It would not produce new water nor improve water conservation.	See comment response 2935-1 regarding reliable water supplies. 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 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. Although conservation components, water storage, 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. Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management, 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.
2935	4	There will be negative economic effects because of impacts on Bay Area tourism, water recreation, fisheries and farmland.	As described in Chapter 6, Surface Water, Section 6.3, in San Francisco Bay, Central Coast, South Coast, Tulare Lake, South Lahontan, and Colorado River hydrologic basins, SWP/CVP water supplies are conveyed in pipelines and canals and do not directly affect surface waters. Construction of facilities under the alternatives all would occur in the Delta of the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River basins. Therefore, the environmental consequences are focused on changes in surface water resources in the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River basins and the Delta. Impacts are not expected in the San Francisco Bay. An assessment of water quality effects resulting from changing Delta water quality and outflows on San Francisco Bay water quality is provided in Impact WQ-34 in Chapter 8, Water Quality, for all alternatives. The water quality assessment considered potential changes in constituent levels for all constituents of concern assessed in detail in Impacts WQ-1 through WQ-30, including changes in salinity, mercury, nutrients, and selenium. The assessment concluded that Alternative 4A would have a less than significant impact to San Francisco Bay water quality.
2936	1	The California WaterFix - bad idea.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
2937	1	I was opposed to the Peripheral Canal and continue to believe that this sort of large-scale diversion is wrong for California. There are many ways to conserve and recycle water at the local level - this State has a long history of research into these methods which your agency should study before taking action that will take away our valuable estuary and its resources.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. Master Response 36 explains how the BDCP or the California WaterFix Project is different from the

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>previously proposed Peripheral Canal. The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats.</p> <p>It is important to note 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>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. 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. Please see Master Response 31 (Delta Reform Act) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) for additional information.</p>
2938	1	This was a bad idea from the start and it still is a very bad idea. It will destroy very valuable estuaries and will not help the water situation.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. 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>
2938	2	Water must be rationed. We in San Diego have saved over our share of water in our county...all counties need to do the same. We need to stop the bottling of water by Nestle and other companies. We need to make sure farmers are not allowing wasteful run off in their fields. There are lots of things we can do until the rains come.	<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 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. Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
2939	1	Water should not be extracted for export by companies such as Nestle that place private profit over public need; nor should water be extracted for "fracking" that increases climate warming gases and endangers the public health as well as the environment.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board.</p> <p>The proposed project Lead Agencies have no power to impose penalties on individual water users. DWR and Reclamation have contracts with various entities, some of which sell water to water retailers, who have individual policies and programs to motivate ratepayers to conserve water. Different districts have the right to take different approaches depending on their individual circumstances.</p> <p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows. Fracking - or "hydraulic fracturing" -- presumably could be an "industrial" use of water, and is a lawful use of water. Pursuant to Senate Bill 4 from 2013 (Stats. 2013, Ch.313), moreover, the state Department of Conservation, through its Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR), is currently working on fracking regulations. Please see Master Response 34 for additional information regarding use of water delivered by proposed water conveyance facilities.</p>
2939	2	Taking water from the Delta will destroy a permanent ecosystem to support a water supply for destructive industries until yet another ecosystem must be destroyed to support their demands.	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. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
2939	3	With 30 year droughts predicted for California, our water should be preserved for the future.	<p>Please see Master Response 3 for information on the purpose and need for the proposed project. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
2940	1	As a lifelong resident of California, I am asking you not to proceed with the plan to construct two water export tunnels under the California WaterFix project. Habitat restoration and strengthening of levees should proceed. But the concept of increased water export through gigantic tunnels is a solution rooted in the past. It ignores much better alternatives to provide Californians, both north and south, with the water they need. Furthermore, it does not address climate change.	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.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
2940	2	Please focus your environmental reviews on better use of the water we do have: for example, subsidizing construction of residential and business greywater systems and upgrading municipal treatment systems to produce potable water.	<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 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. Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management, 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.</p>
2940	3	Investing in the tunnels would constitute a massive misallocation of scarce resources. And it would not solve the problem.	DWR acknowledges your opposition to the project. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
2940	4	Climate change, rising temperatures, and decreased snowpack will mean less water available. Less water will irreparably damage the ecosystem of the San Francisco Bay-Delta.	Climate change will result in rising temperatures and decreased snowpack and those changes will change runoff into the Delta, as is discussed throughout the DEIR/S. However, as stated in Chapter 29 of the DEIR/S, "No single project and indeed none of the BDCP alternatives would be able to completely counteract all of the impacts of climate change; however, as shown below the BDCP alternatives provide important added resilience and adaptability to many of the expected changes."
2940	5	Investing in the EcoRestore program will do little good if increasing amounts of Delta water are siphoned off.	<p>The primary parallel (and separate) habitat restoration program is called California EcoRestore (EcoRestore), which will be overseen by the California Resources Agency and implemented under the California Water Action Plan. Under EcoRestore, the state will pursue restoration of more than 30,000 acres of fish and wildlife habitat by 2020. These habitat restoration actions will be implemented faster and more reliably by separating them from the water conveyance facility implementation.</p> <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.</p> <p>The plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Although the project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented California Waterfix project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>years.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) for further information.</p>
2940	6	If the twin tunnels were built, it is entirely reasonable to expect rising demand from irrigation districts and municipal water works, further relegating the Delta to simply be a water conveyance system.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in SWP and CVP deliveries in drier periods.
2941	1	Instead of wasting ratepayer money on unnecessary new tunnels, our State and local water agencies should invest in rebuilding our crumbling local water and sewer infrastructure, cleaning and augmenting groundwater, expanding rainwater catchment systems, recycling water, and improving water efficiency in the residential, commercial, and agricultural sectors. Not only would these measures secure our water supply, they would improve water quality, prevent pollution and create long-term jobs.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Appendix 1C of the Final EIR/EIS, Demand Management Measures, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. Refer to Master Response 6 for more information on demand management. Although components such as desalination plants and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the State, they are beyond the scope of the project. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.</p>
2941	2	The San Francisco Bay Delta is the hub of California's water system. The Delta is also a unique and priceless ecosystem that depends on flows through it. Depriving the Delta of flows through a diversion point on the Sacramento River will destroy the Delta habitat and economy.	<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. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.</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 in drier years; and increase exports in the wet winter months in wetter years when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods. As shown in Appendix 5A, Section C, Delta outflow would be similar under the proposed project as compared to the No Action Alternative. Summer Delta outflows under the proposed</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			project and No Action Alternative would be less than under Existing Conditions due to climate change and sea level rise.
2941	3	The Tunnels represent a 20th century model of delivering water that won't work in the climate-change challenged present. Increasing temperatures will dramatically alter flow patterns as diminished snowpack becomes the new normal. Less water will be available for export at the same time that more water must be held to preserve salmon habitat and Delta water quality. Increased reliance on Delta exports that will not be available run contrary to preserving the ecosystem.	<p>The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>The anticipated hydrologic changes due to climate change (increased temperatures and more years of critical dryness, increased water temperatures, changes in precipitation and runoff patterns, sea level rise, and tidal variations) will constrain and challenge future water management practices across the state, with or without the proposed project. The state is addressing climate change through strategies and a decision-making framework as outlined in the California Climate Adaptation Strategy and Adaptation Planning Guide. However, no single project and indeed none of the project alternatives would be able to completely counteract all of the impacts of climate change.</p> <p>More information on ways in which the California WaterFix proposes to improve resiliency and adaptability of the Delta to climate change can be found in Chapter 29, Climate Change, EIR/EIS and Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, EIR/EIS.</p>
2941	4	While some construction and planning jobs would be created to build the tunnels, this would come at the expense of jobs created in the communities where we live and work. In a tough economy, we know that ratepayers can only afford to pay so much. Thus, we should invest in fixing our failing local infrastructure, not helping finance a project that will primarily benefit large corporate interests.	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 socioeconomic impacts and its associated mitigation measures please see Chapter 16 of the FEIR/EIS.
2942	1	All permits for housing tracts in the desert should be stopped. It is insane to allow development where water does not exist. Make no mistake, this is about property taxes the state wants. Our Democratic run state will trade drinking water supplies during a drought for taxes.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the 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>
2943	1	It is not environmentally feasible that Delta water can serve the needs of the whole state -- particularly the needs of the desert areas of the southern part of the state. It's time we started living within some of the environmental restrictions of the areas within which we live. Please do not make a mess of one environmental area just to serve the insatiable needs of another area. We have seen too many estuaries in the states and world ruined because of similar projects.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
2944	1	Pumping water all over the state is a bad idea on many levels. We waste enough electricity and cause enough messes playing water shuffle as it is. The "fix" that should be under consideration is dramatically reducing water use -- even if it means cutting off Big Agriculture and making them figure out how to dry farm.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>More than two-thirds of the residents of the state and more than two million acres of highly productive farm land receive water exported from the Delta watershed. The proposed project aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. However, the project proponents have no authority to designate what water is used for.</p> <p>One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board.</p> <p>The proposed project Lead Agencies have no power to impose penalties on individual water users. DWR and Reclamation have contracts with various entities, some of which sell water to water retailers, who have individual policies and programs to motivate ratepayers to conserve water. Different districts have the right to take different approaches depending on their individual circumstances.</p>
2945	1	This is not properly maintaining the Delta; this project is to send all the water possible to Southern California. You would be destroying the Delta for Westlands water users. You would be destroying the fisheries dependent on the Delta. You would destroy the 150 Delta farms that we need and that are in the appropriate location for the food that we need, not almonds. Support our Delta farms and our fisheries for a change.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use in Southern California and Master Response 3 for more information on the purpose and need for the project. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
2946	1	<p>Having water bypass the Delta will take needed flows away from fish, birds, and wildlife. The loss of the largest estuary on the west coast of North America is not worth the cost of a pair of new tunnels. Already 75% of native California fish species are in trouble. Removing and redirecting additional water from our natural waterways will only exacerbate the problem.</p> <p>We require some innovative Californian thinking about this problem that does not imperil our degraded environment.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the 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. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
2947	1	We cannot keep using more water from environmentally sensitive areas to solve our	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		internal problems of burgeoning population and the waste of a precious resource.	Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II 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.
2948	1	I was unable to take action on the Delta tunnels website.	This comment cannot be addressed without knowing exactly what website URL the commenter is referring to. Comments on the DEIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS were received via email, mail and at public meetings. The websites, www.BayDeltaConservationPlan.com and www.CaliforniaWaterFix.com provided information on how to provide comments. 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).
2949	1	This continues to be a project where the negatives continue to significantly outweigh the positives. It is not constructive and should not be constructed. Southern California needs to plan for saving water from the El Nino and other tropical storms that come it's way. Preserve the Delta habitat. Discard the twin tunnels plan.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The 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. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 35 regarding southern California's water supply.
2951	1	I oppose the building of any dams or reservoirs or increasing the size of any existing reservoirs. I would support efforts to restore riparian habitats throughout the state. In light of the fact that the Sierra Nevada Mountains no longer receive adequate snow fall there will be no water to export south and not enough water to restore ground water levels. I also support regulations that require low flush toilets and showerheads to be installed in all new commercial, industrial, or residential construction. I also support regulations that upon sale of a building all toilets, sinks, showers, bathtubs, etc. be replaced with low flush/flow models. In addition I support waste management practices and technologies that would significantly reduce the current amounts of water used to manage and treat waste.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. As a project 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. Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need. 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. For information regarding why water storage was not included in the proposed project, refer to Master Response 37 (Water Storage) and Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS. Also, please refer to Master Response 4 for information on the selection of alternatives.
2952	1	We cannot believe the government is willing to destroy the Sacramento and San Joaquin river systems and their Delta so that others can water lawns, fill swimming pools and grow water intensive crops.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown 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>We actually want to create a miniature (extinct) Colorado Delta?</p> <p>Apparently salmon, green sturgeon, herons, egrets, delta farmers, etc., etc; are totally unimportant.</p> <p>When the Delta dies are we then going to spend billions more to try and revive it?</p> <p>No more salmon runs, no more income from fishermen. Another extinct salmon.</p> <p>Why id Southern California more important than Northern California?</p>	<p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
2953	1	<p>With forecast rises in sea level we must restore our wetlands.</p> <p>Isn't this the job that BDCP has promised to do?</p> <p>We must protect our Delta habitat.</p> <p>Stop exporting water to Southern California.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>A primary goal of the BDCP would be to restore wetlands and protect Delta habitats. However, please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. The preferred alternative includes AMMs for reducing impacts and mitigation measures for significant impacts on wetlands and habitats, but wetland restoration would take place under a separate program, California Eco Restore. Refer to Master Response 3 for information on the Purpose and Need of the proposed project.</p>
2954	1	<p>This project was originally 'sold' as being about Delta restoration; a lie. Twin tunnels will destroy the Delta and empty northern California reservoirs. And all the additional reservoirs in the world won't make it rain. "Big Agriculture", especially all the cattle and dairy production in the San Joaquin, should not be subsidized with my tax dollars!</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Cattle and dairy production is outside the scope of the proposed 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.</p>
2955	1	<p>It is not acceptable diverting water from Northern California to the south. We need to desalinate- not destroy the ecosystem. Also, Sourhern Californians waste enormous amounts of water and do not understand how critical the drought is. I personally witnessed enormous amounts of waste. Water running down streets and rain birds operating in the middle of the wrong watering days- clueless and uncaring!</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.</p>
2956	1	<p>The Delta estuary is one of California's most valuable natural resources.</p> <p>Building the tunnels will greatly increase the intrusion of saltwater into the Delta, with disastrous results for the environment, for people, and for one of the most persecuted species in the State - our wild fish - salmon, trout, bass, striped bass - a resource just as</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		valuable as our farms.	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.
2957	1	In my humble opinion, the money would be better spent on re-charging our state's aquifers. Whenever people would complain about the rain, I would answer: "means snow in the Sierra, like money in the bank". With the lack of potential for snow storage, the sensible alternative is in-ground storage, and the sooner the better, before subsidence from overdrawing reduces the storage capacity of the aquifers.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The 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. Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management, 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.</p>
2958	1	<p>This is primarily directed to Governor Brown, but I encourage my local representatives to read this as well, as I have damn near given up on making the wolf in moonbeam clothes see the light regarding our most basic essential resource.</p> <p>Since you have not abandoned this ridiculously expensive and incredibly destructive plan despite all the factual evidence that it is not a real solution to California's water consumption makes me believe that your sustainable energy proposals are nothing more than a smoke screen to mollify conservation minded voters. All the clean kilowatts in the world will not do us a whit of good if we are out of water, and anyone who studies the water supply system with a pragmatic, scientific approach would conclude that deadbeat dams and conveyance systems are not a part of the solution in the 21st century.</p> <p>We have a serious groundwater overdraft situation, and the best the legislature can come up with is a plan that takes over 25 years to implement makes me want to spit nails and bile. A saner way to spend massive money is to implement a groundwater recharge program now. This is serious a threat to our future as climate change is, or as Hitler and Hirohito were 75 years ago. We had the political and social will to confront that threat with urgency, and now, despite all our technological advances we come up with a 25 year plan that doesn't address climate appropriate crops and permits drilling new wells that exacerbate the situation.</p> <p>Governor, it is time for you to give up on your Daddy's dream to suck our state dry to benefit a few overly subsidized water wasters.</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>This comment is an opinion on the merits of the California WaterFix and the need for a groundwater recharge program instead of the proposed project. No specific comments on the EIR/EIS content or process has been provided. The Sustainable Groundwater Management Act is currently being implemented to help improve the condition of critical groundwater basins across the state.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be roughly 10 percent more or less than the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p>
2959	1	Rather than build these ridiculous tunnels, California should prepare and execute a water policy which addresses 21st century needs and values.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>This includes but is not limited to:</p> <p>Ending corporate welfare in the form of water subsidies</p> <p>Eliminating overseas water exportation in the form of alfalfa and other water intensive crops</p> <p>Recognizing California is a desert and encouraging water use accordingly</p> <p>Acknowledging evaporation loss and assigning cost to this for future surface projects</p> <p>Covering the existing State and Federal canals</p> <p>Purchasing the Westlands Water District and shutting it down</p> <p>Implementing new conservation programs such as mandatory toilet replacement and rebates; no agricultural water for flooding fields; no urban water for lawns</p> <p>Punishing water wasters and cheaters</p> <p>The tunnels are not needed, are wasteful, and, if built, will perpetuate 19th century bankrupt thinking!</p>	<p>index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project is one component, among many, of the California Water Action Plan. 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>By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns while securing reliable water deliveries. Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. 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, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 34 for additional details on the determination of beneficial use.</p>
2960	1	<p>I believe that the growth in the population of California will require more diligent preservation of the wilderness, including the rivers and the wetlands.</p> <p>I want my children and grandchildren to enjoy these opportunities and practice more conservation rather than undertake these projects.</p> <p>It is unconscionable to see cotton and other crops grown in California that consume far too much of our precious water. Why isn't this being addressed adequately?</p> <p>The farmers of the Central Valley have far too much political power; and their voice appears to be more important than the rest of the citizens of this fine State.</p> <p>It's time to address this.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>More than two-thirds of the residents of the state and more than two million acres of highly productive farm land receive water exported from the Delta watershed. The proposed project aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. However, the project proponents have no authority to designate what water is used for.</p> <p>One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board.</p> <p>The proposed project Lead Agencies have no power to impose penalties on individual water users. DWR and Reclamation have contracts with various entities, some of which sell water to water retailers, who have individual policies and programs to motivate ratepayers to conserve water. Different districts have the right to take different approaches depending on their individual circumstances.</p>
2961	1	<p>Before we move forward on any water infrastructure projects, we need to stop and re-price the water the federal and state projects are already delivering. Subsidizing water as we do today only encourages wasting water. Pricing should include the cost of changing the natural ecosystem that harms other uses (e.g. salmon fisheries, recreation).</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Until we make this change we will continue down a path of patching a fundamentally broken system.</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p>
2962	1	<p>My family has lived, farmed and ranched in the Delta for over 100 years. The Delta has some of the richest farmland in the world and is essential to the health of San Francisco Bay and wildlife.</p> <p>Sending Delta water to the arid south is not only costly but will ruin a unique environment.</p> <p>Sending water to farm the arid farmland is ridiculous since after a few years of irrigation the soil turns saline. Only large agriculture interests in pursuit of fast money will profit. Also if the population of Southern California cannot or will not conserve water then they and Big Agriculture should pay for recycling their existing water or paying for desalination of ocean 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>For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.</p>
2963	1	<p>If you rob the delta of its water resource, then we will have a complete unbalance of the nature of things. Whenever we change the balance we pay a dear price in the long run. History has shown this and this is why we voice our information to you about what the end results of such projects will do to damage the environment. But, blind eyes do not want to evaluate history because it does not agree with their personal agendas. Excuses can be made for why we need these tunnels, but they are not valid enough to justify the supposed need.</p> <p>What is more important is what will happen to the Delta and the other rivers feeding it. The effect will be great. You might say "we need the tunnels because of the drought" but drought situations are why we do not need them. Look at how the Delta already suffers because of the less water flow from the slower rivers, brackish water further upstream. Do you want to create another San Joaquin River, once a mighty river that now loses its natural flow? We tried to save it with a canal re-feeding it with Delta water that is a non-natural brackish water which now disrupts the natural habitat, not to mention bad water imported for farmers crops. History, history, history! Look at it and make a real evaluation of what damage will result from the tunnels. You tried to appease the concerns with promises of protecting the environment in the bill but just because promises are in a bill does not make the overall bill right. Now with the additions and omissions of the tunnel proposals today there is a complete lack of concern for the safety of the Delta. There is no excuse for the destruction of our delta no matter how small the effect is as you purport. Pull your proverbial heads out of the sand and make true evaluations of historical data. The sand your heads could end up in is the sand of a dried up Delta.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Since the late 1800s, the Bay-Delta ecosystem has been substantially altered. Changes in key environmental attributes of the Bay-Delta have contributed to the current degraded state of the ecosystem and appear to be proximate causes of declines in desired fishes and increases in non-native species. California WaterFix is not intended to address all the factors that have contributed to the Delta's decline and briefly summarizes a few but not all of those factors. Many factors that have contributed to the decline of the Delta's ecosystem including the conversion of tidal marsh and floodplains to farmland, construction of levees and altering of tide flows, in-Delta and upstream water diversions, contaminant discharges, ammonia and nutrient discharges and changes to the food web, increases in water temperatures, and introduction of non-native and invasive species. The Delta will remain in a highly altered state for the foreseeable future and the project is not intended to address all the past harms or restore the Delta to a pre-altered state.</p> <p>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>One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>by the State Water Board (Master Response 34 [Beneficial Uses]).</p> <p>The alternatives included in the Draft EIR/EIS 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. In fact, as a direct result of the extensive public comments and agency input, the water facility and conveyance options proposed as part of the project changed significantly during the planning process in ways that reduce impacts in the Delta communities. Additional unique Alternatives that were proposed during review of Administrative Drafts of the BDCP and EIR/S were also considered and described, See Appendix 3A of the EIR/EIS and Section 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS.</p> <p>Please also refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives), Master Response 31 (Delta Reform Act), and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
2964	1	This is another case of big contributors receiving special consideration at the expense of taxpayers, in this case, Central Valley agribusiness, and the insatiable builders and developers in Southern California. It must cease. Stop the theft now!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
2965	1	Do not let the large water users take even more than they do now. Let your legacy of serving all of California stand for your principles, not just the demands of big agriculture. Please save our rivers from the over planting of agriculture requiring more water than the state has to give without harmful effects to our fish and wildlife.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
2966	1	No on new construction costs and habitat rehab. A moratorium on water hookup and re-aligning the grandfathered water usage south of the Sacramento Delta first, is better math.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The 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. Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management, 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.
2967	1	There are so many significant reasons to oppose this project: moral, environmental, habitat preservation, ecosystem coordination, farming, and water availability for those in Northern California, both for public and private uses, that it is boggling. It is simply wrong to transfer water to Southern California when there are no modifications of the use of it there, no moratorium on building, no prevention of overuse for water intensive crops, no provision for re-sale of precious water rights, this is simply taking it by the powerful and rich. Untenable!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Regarding water use, the proposed project does not make determinations regarding how water delivered through the proposed project conveyance or other water conveyance facility will be put to a beneficial use. The State Water Resources Control Board is charged with the comprehensive planning and allocation of water resources in California. One of the State Water Resources Control Board's charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. Please refer to Master Response 34 for additional details on beneficial use. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 35 regarding Southern California's water supply.</p>
2968	1	[It is] way past time to stop using taxpayer dollars for projects like this that cater to special interests and leave our precious environment compromised.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 5 regarding funding.</p>
2968	2	As our population grows the need and desire for natural environments will expand, not diminish. This project is foolish.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
2969	1	I find it hard to believe that this project is even being considered. Northern California can not afford to send more of its water south. I see there must be political pull involved as this project would decimate major portions of Northern California. It's not like we have an excess of water. As a fourth generation Northern Californian, I would hate to see this area destroyed by the BDCP project. Even the name is deceptive. The suggestions below are a much better approach to the lack of	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		water.	Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.
2970	1	If we are serious about long term water solutions, we need to divert every penny of those BDCP billions to water recycling, conservation technology, groundwater re-charge, and other practical and ethical steps. Can we please, please get that done before we crash the Delta ecosystem?	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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. 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.</p>
2971	1	This project is no better than the peripheral canal of earlier times. No water should be reallocated to southern California, until all citizens of the state practice excellent water conservation, including personal reclamation of gray water to water one's property.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 36 regarding the Peripheral Canal.</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 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. Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including storm water drainage. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p>
2972	1	<p>Responses to Draft EIR/EIS comments: Transmission Agency of Northern California initially submitted 24 comments on July 28, 2014 titled: "California Environmental Quality Act Comments from the Transmission Agency of Northern California and California-Oregon Transmission Project Regarding the Proposed Bay-Delta Conservation Plan and Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement." Those comments are reiterated herein (as submitted in 2014) as ATT 1. Please consider those comments applicable as relevant to the changing nature of the configuration of each of the alternatives being considered in the current draft.</p> <p>We look forward to a separate, distinct, and clearly understandable response to each of those 24 comments submitted in 2014, consistent with your commitment on pages 1-30</p>	<p>As explained in the Executive Summary of the RDEIR/SDEIS, all of the comments received during the Draft EIR/EIS 2013–2014 public review period were considered in the development of the RDEIR/SDEIS. The RDEIR/SDEIS does not include responses to comments on the Draft EIR/EIS, though some revisions have been made in response to comments received on the Draft EIR/EIS. Consistent with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA Guidelines §15088) and the National Environmental Policy Act (Council on Environmental Quality § 1503.4) and policies held by all Lead Agencies governing the implementation of CEQA and NEPA, all comments received on the Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS are included with the Final EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 42 regarding treatment of public comments.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		of the current draft regarding individual comments.	
2972	2	<p>Proposed power transmission relocation of the California Oregon Transmission project towers affected by the Clifton Court Forebay/Byron Tracy Forebay Expansion: Transmission Agency of Northern California- California Oregon Transmission Project Comment 7 on the Draft EIR/EIS in 2014 addressed the general issue of expansion of the Clifton Court Forebay/Byron Tract Forebay that would cross, and therefore flood the COTP right of way (ROW).</p> <p>The Draft EIR/EIS did not identify a specific corridor for relocating a portion of the COTP ROW. The Current Draft has introduced new information, better specifying the proposed relocation of six or more COTP transmission towers to a location southeast of an expanded Clifton Court Forebay. This new information includes additional text and figures regarding the new "Power Transmission Relocation" identified as follows:</p> <p>1: Appendix A: Page 13-11: The power transmission relocation area south of Clifton Court Forebay would also affect approximately 13 structures.</p> <p>2: Appendix A: Page 24-24: In addition to construction of a "split" transmission line system, an existing 230 kV and 500 kV transmission line, which rw1 parallel south of Clifton Court Forebay, would be relocated to an area further south/southeast within 0.5 mile of their original location.</p> <p>3: Appendix A: Page 25-72: In addition, an existing 500 kV transmission line south/southeast of the Clifton Court Forebay will be relocated to an area less than half a mile southeast of the current location of the existing towers.</p> <p>4: Mapbook Figures: M3-4; Sheet 12 of 15; M12-4: Sheet 6 of 8; M13-4: Sheet 6 of 8; M14-8: Sheet 6 of 8; M15-4: Sheet 6 of 8.</p> <p>This is not an all-inclusive list, but is indicative of new information substantiating a new CEQA comment. We understand the uncertainties associated with identifying specific locations for project features and the associated utility relocations. The editorial revisions listed above as appearing in the Land Use, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Public Health, and probably as yet undiscovered chapters and/or sections in the extensive current draft or an appendix thereto, demonstrate that the authors of the current draft may consider the relocation of 500kV transmission towers as an "afterthought," or otherwise incidental activity that simply requires appropriate coordination similar to the routine relocation of other utility facilities and lines. We can understand that such relocations are rarely analyzed in conventional environmental documents for much smaller programs and projects and hope that the following comments can help inform the current draft authors and the BDCP agencies regarding the magnitude of major power line relocations. The relocation of any portion of a 500 k V transmission line is a major undertaking. It includes the time and cost needed for, but not necessarily limited to the following activities:</p> <p>1: Acquiring the easements and land rights needed for a new ROW and access roads for the transmission towers;</p> <p>2: Obtaining all environmental permits and approvals needed for establishing a new ROW and access roads. This permitting and approvals plan would depend on the biological, cultural, natural, and other physical and environmental resources that could</p>	<p>The commenter's input on the magnitude of transmission line relocation is appreciated. The commenter is assured that relocation of transmission lines is not an afterthought and is analyzed to detail available at this stage in the project. The alignment of the required transmission line and its interconnection point would be based on the selection of a power provider for the project following selection of a conveyance alignment. This selection is ongoing and the alignment of the transmission lines will be finalized at a later date. At that time, all of the commenter's concerns will be analyzed in detail in coordination with the selected power provider.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>be affected by the new transmission ROW. This includes all NEPA and CEQA compliance, associated agency consultations, and related surveys, studies, and investigations needed to ensure that the new ROW can be legally perfected.</p> <p>3: Conducting all design, engineering, and operational planning and interagency coordination needed prior to removing the existing line from service. These activities would be needed to support the development of a definite plan of action for cost-effectively relocating the line with minimum disruption to grid reliability.</p> <p>4: Coordinating a transmission line outage. At any time, the COTP can be transmitting 1,600 or more megawatts of electric energy within the California electric grid. Removing this level of transmission from the grid for any period of time requires an "outage" of the line. Outages require extensive coordination with other transmission operators, often a year in advance to ensure that the grid can operate reliably during the planned outage. Outages therefore result in expensive coordination, operational, and related administrative costs. Outages also result in lost revenue resulting from foregone sales of power to TANC-COTP customers for the duration of the outage. Outages of the 500kV COTP would be needed for relocating transmission towers. The length of these outages would depend on the required construction of new towers and all associated interconnection and energization activities.</p> <p>5: Responding to all legal challenges, legislation, and litigation associated with relocation from whatever source and regarding any and all issues.</p> <p>If relocation is truly needed when its costs and benefits are compared to the cost/benefit analysis of the hydrologic modifications that would preclude the need for expanding Clifton Court Forebay/Byron Tract Forebay, the BDCP agencies would be responsible for all costs associated with relocation, as defined by TANC and the Western Area Power Administration. But for the BDCP /Water Fix project, such relocation costs would not need to be incurred.</p>	
2972	3	<p>Coordinated planning with Transmission Agency of Northern California-California-Oregon Transmission Project and Western: The easements comprising the portions of the potentially affected COTP right-of-way (ROW) of concern are held by the United States and administered by the Western Area Power Administration (Western), a federal agency under the Department of Energy. Western also acts as the TANC Operations and Maintenance agent, for the benefit of all of the COTP participants (which include TANC, Western, the Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), the City of Redding, the Carmichael Water District and the San Juan Water District). Those easements include provisions to protect against any additional uses affecting the COTP ROW that could interfere with the safe operation and maintenance of the COTP facilities. The COTP transmission towers and conductors are owned by TANC.</p> <p>It is our understanding that the proposed relocation of the COTP transmission towers would be accompanied by the simultaneous relocation of six or more adjacent Western transmission towers that would otherwise be flooded by the Clifton Court Forebay/Byron Tract Forebay expansion. Western owns the easements, towers, and conductors associated with the adjacent "Tracy-Hurley" 230kV transmission lines.</p> <p>Because of the relationship between TANC-COTP and Western, it is imperative that the</p>	See Response to Comment 2972-2.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		BDCP agencies coordinate all transmission relocation proposals associated with these lines simultaneously among TANC, the COTP, and Western. Please coordinate all proposed tower relocations and other planned activities affecting the COTP ROW and the Western Tracy-Hurley towers/ROW simultaneously with Western and TANC from the initiation through the conclusion of all such proposals and discussions. Many of the legal, operational, maintenance, and related reliability considerations associated with the TANC-COTP-Western responsibilities are intricately intermingled, and could not be effectively addressed in isolation from one another.	
2972	4	<p>Unacceptable corridor proposed for relocation of the Transmission Agency of Northern California-California-Oregon Transmission Project Transmission Towers: The proposed "Power Transmission Relocation" corridor as identified on the current draft mapbook figures [M3-4: Sheet; M12-4: Sheet 6; M13-4: Sheet 6; M14-8: Sheet 6; M15-4: Sheet 6], would be unacceptable to TANC as currently proposed.</p> <p>It is not unreasonable to assume that future state, federal, and south-of-Delta water agency efforts targeting greater quantities of water diversions through the BDCP /Water Fix facilities would require additional future expansions of the Clifton Court and Byron Tract Forebays. Such reasonably foreseeable future expansions beyond the implementation of the BDCP /Water Fix as currently proposed could have the potential to call yet again for another expensive relocation of the affected TANC transmission towers, if not additional segments of the existing right-of-way ROW. A ROW located sufficiently far enough away from a potentially expanding Forebay complex would probably be a more prudent long-term solution, if needed.</p> <p>Existing ground conditions, including high water tables and potentially unstable substratum in the area proposed for COTP tower relocations would be exacerbated by adjacent flooding of the expanded forebays and subsequent lateral seepage. Tower stability and integrity are of utmost importance from public health, safety and grid reliability perspectives.</p>	Relocation for the purposes of the proposed project was analyzed. See Response to Comment 2972-2.
2972	5	Request for comprehensive, complete, and timely communications to TANC regarding the Bay-Delta Conservation Plan programs and California Water Fix Partially Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS: Transmission Agency of Northern California and the California-Oregon Transmission Project are essential to maintaining the reliability of the California electric grid and maintain substantial ongoing investments in transmission towers, conductors, substations, communication sites, real property assets, and related operations and maintenance equipment that may be affected by the BDCP /California Water Fix Programs. We fully understand that the BDCP/California Water Fix program is subject to significant changes in configuration, timing, the nature of proposed alternatives, and the physical and natural resources impacts as ultimately may be expressed across the landscape. In light of these inevitable changes, and the high likelihood that such changes could affect other TANC and COTP properties and assets in new and different locations and ways, please consider this comment as our request that the following email addresses be added to all mailing lists for the BDCP /California Water Fix Programs: info@tanc.us; dwagenet@tanc.us	See Response to Comment 2972-2.
2972	6	ATT 1: Transmission Agency of Northern California's July 28, 2014 comments on the BDCP EIR/EIS (Letters BDCP 1573 and RECIRC506)	This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter that includes the commenter's 2014 comments on the BDCP and Draft EIR/EIS. All comments received during the 2013 and 2015 public comment period are included in the FEIR/EIS. Please refer to the table of commenters to locate the letter of interest. This attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in the comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
2973	1	The voters have rejected previous attempts to divert more of the fresh water flowing to the delta and I feel this twin tunnels scheme is just an attempt to do an end run around the will of the voters on this issue. In addition I feel this scheme is just wrong at a time when our society should be following a policy of "do no harm" when dealing with such major environmental issues.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
2974	1	Please focus on fixing our roads and bridges, not making our water diversion and environmental legacy worse.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
2975	1	I have submitted another alternative to the tunnels that costs less and does not take any more water than is already taken by the canal. I do not know why this has not been considered. To cover the existing canal prevents evaporation and eliminates dumping and contamination that has to be dealt with at the other end. Please do not destroy our Delta by building the 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>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 EIR/EIS in Chapter 3 (section 3.2) and Appendix 3A thoroughly explain the process used to develop the alternatives, and explain why certain potential alternatives were considered but ultimately rejected by the Lead Agencies.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.</p>
2976	1	What is the plan for "endangered humans"? All that I see is bickering and taking hard positions with no compromises or working things out for the betterment of our state.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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
2976	2	You want support, financial and otherwise. Then work things out for the betterment of all including the smelt and humans.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
2977	1	Why not just make a tunnel out of the existing aqueduct by installing solar panels on top? That will reduce evaporation and provide some electrical power. Maybe a utility company or companies would take this on. The Netherlands have solar powered bike trails, why not one of those?	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.</p>
2977	2	We need to identify and protect all of our water sources from pollution from fracking and other sources and we need to protect from exploitation by inappropriate uses. Waiting two years to stop frackers from dumping pollution into an aquifer or river is horrid! Once polluted, it may no longer be viable for anything. We can live without fossil fuel more easily that we can live without potable water!	<p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows. Fracking - or "hydraulic fracturing" -- presumably could be an "industrial" use of water, and is a lawful use of water. Pursuant to Senate Bill 4 from 2013 (Stats. 2013, Ch.313), moreover, the state Department of Conservation, through its Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR), is currently working on fracking regulations. Please see Master Response 34 for additional information regarding use of water delivered by proposed water conveyance facilities.</p> <p>One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board.</p> <p>The proposed project Lead Agencies have no power to impose penalties on individual water users. DWR and Reclamation have contracts with various entities, some of which sell water to water retailers, who have individual policies and programs to motivate ratepayers to conserve water. Different districts have the right to take different approaches depending on their individual circumstances.</p>
2978	1	The governor's plan will waste taxpayer money (for the purposes of lining the pockets of agro-tycoons who should never have planted permanent crops in the southern San Joaquin Valley).	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>
2978	2	The twin tunnels will decimate the Delta. We will lose habitat for fish, birds, and other creatures that were living here in harmony with native peoples until "the rest of us" came west. Trade what is left of a treasure from our Creator so the southlands can have cheap water? No.	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. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			were raised.
2979	1	While I do support agriculture and the need to provide food and keep our farm economy strong, the BDCP plan goes too far, is too expensive and is going to hurt the Delta environment and hurt the quality of life in Northern California and potentially damage the riverine environment for several rivers.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
2979	2	We need fewer dams not more dams. We need to find another way to deal with drought. This plan is not the solution.	<p>The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage.</p> <p>The 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. See Master Response 37 for water storage information.</p>
2980	1	Please let us leave nature the way it is meant to be. Every time we try to fix something in the natural environment, we are more likely to make conditions worse. It is so important that this habitat be protected and maintained. I am totally against these tunnels. I think it is a bad idea. Maybe well intentioned, but bad none the less!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The 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. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
2981	1	There is an alternative I believe to better serve the people and resources of this great state put forth by Greg Coppes, the Tulare project. It would cost less and be	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		implemented faster with much less negative environmental impact.	<p>index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The 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). 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 EIR/EIS in Chapter 3 (section 3.2) and Appendix 3A thoroughly explain the process used to develop the alternatives, and explain why certain potential alternatives were considered but ultimately rejected by the Lead Agencies.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.</p>
2982	1	<p>I live in SoCal and the use of recycled water should be increased.</p> <p>Residents are doing a good job of conserving, but the water districts are raising rates to cover salaries. Attention to groundwater is lagging. Why pump more water south to be mismanaged?</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>It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 (Demand Management) for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>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>
2983	1	<p>I oppose the BDCP plan to build tunnels, because of the drastic effect it would have on the Delta. We need more wetlands all along the Coast to prevent flooding. We need wiser means of collecting and storing rainwater - as serious storms are predicted and can be expected as a result of climate change. We do not need costly tunnels that take water away from the habitats that need and rely on it, in order to create thirsty developments in dryer parts of the state.</p> <p>True, agriculture needs more water, and it is for agriculture that we must develop wiser means of collecting rainwater and distributing it to agri-business. But also, let agribusiness work on a solution to this problem and pay for at least part of it, as it will be the main beneficiary.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Response 34 for additional details on the determination of beneficial use.
2984	1	The water located in this region must remain here for the aquatic fish, birds, and other animals that live in and around the Bay! Also, the water is essential for various agricultural needs as well as supplying the water needs for the Pacific Flyway during migration and over the winter! We do not need to be supplying more water for Southern California to water their lawns and golf courses! Southern California residents and businesses need to learn how to conserve their limited water resources, not steal water from others!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p>
2985	1	It's time that we looked at larger holistic solutions-turn to places that have implemented conservation, education, and new technologies successfully (like in Australia). If we've learned any lessons in California it is that the system we currently use of moving water around the state and over-allocating our rivers is not the solution. Let's start setting the precedent for the forward thinking state we are and not move backward in time, the overdevelopment of our resources.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Appendix 1C of the Final EIR/EIS, Demand Management Measures, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. Refer to Master Response 6 for more information on demand management. Although components such as desalination plants and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the State, they are beyond the scope of the project. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.</p>
2986	1	The BDCP will destroy the Delta and the wildlife in it. This is nothing more than a bypass to take north water and move it south. The Delta will not survive having the water diverted to tunnels and bypass the habitat that you are claiming to improve and save.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
2986	2	<p>You are telling us a lie pure and simple. I have read the environmental impact surveys done by UC Davis. They have written a report that is absurd.</p> <p>The UC system is being bought and paid for with the promise of getting ten years worth of research grants to study the effect of the BDCP on the species present. They are going to be nothing more than the expert wittiness to the death of the Delta Bay environment. We will have nothing more than a swampy cesspool instead of a thriving Delta.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The commenter has apparently confused the UC Davis report, "Transitions for the Delta Economy," with the Draft EIR/EIS. UC Davis was not involved with the preparation of the Draft EIR/EIS. The comment does not address the Draft EIR/EIS; no text change is needed.</p>
2987	1	<p>More dams and water storage projects are not going to add a significant amount of "new" water and are economically unfeasible. I strongly oppose building tunnels to move more water from Northern California to the south and have a severe impact on our endangered salmon and steelhead.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p>
2988	1	<p>It becomes more obvious every day people in powerful positions are making misinformed decisions on life threatening issues like our need for clean water. Since you show you do not know what you are doing and the damage you are wrecking on the planet you need to step back from pushing any more for this plan. To continue the push is pure evil and anti life.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>
2989	1	<p>Rather than sending more water south, it seems wiser to control growth in the south for the limited water supply that the south already has access to. The Delta habitat should not be made to suffer due to uncontrolled growth. The Delta is the lifeline of our ecosystem for California. It already is on the edge of ruin. Do not support more destruction just for the sake of more water going south.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment raises import policy issues concerning sustainable growth and available water supplies in California, as well as the environmental effects of additional Delta exports. However, the comment does not question the growth inducement analysis or conclusions of Chapter 30. No additional response is needed.</p>
2990	1	<p>I firmly believe the tunnels project will kill what is left of the Delta. Government stewardship of this precious resource to date has been negligent to criminal. This needs to stop. Start serving the people you are supposed to serve instead of the water magnates.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the Clean Water Act and federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial. 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>
2991	1	<p>This proposed plan is outrageous especially in this time of history when we have already seen and experienced consequences of poor river stewardship across the state! After the fifty years of this proposed plan, then what ? Even more extensive damage will have been committed to the state's river ways, tributaries and Deltas and more!</p> <p>Please vote the twin tunnels and new diversions down!! Dams are disastrous to the health of rivers and all who depend on them, including humans. I have recently witnessed the removal of the San Clemente Dam on the Carmel River. That is history in the making as the largest dam removal in the state of CA so far. Let that set a precedent to allow rivers across California return to their natural flow.</p> <p>Conservation-oriented alternatives exist! We must learn to live within our means.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p>
2992	1	<p>It is imperative that we preserve the nature areas that remain in this overpopulated state. Please let the natural, fresh water habitat of the Delta remain intact. It is our responsibility to protect wildlife habitats for future generations.</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>Although Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A include only those habitat restoration measures needed to provide mitigation for specific regulatory compliance purposes, habitat restoration is still recognized as a critical component of the state's long-term plans for the Delta. Such larger endeavors, however, will likely be implemented over time under actions separate and apart from these alternatives. The primary parallel habitat restoration program is called California EcoRestore (EcoRestore), which will be overseen by the California Resources Agency and implemented under the California Water Action Plan. Under EcoRestore, the state will pursue restoration of more than 30,000 acres of fish and wildlife habitat by 2020. These habitat restoration actions will be implemented faster and more reliably by separating them from the water conveyance facility implementation.</p> <p>Proposition 1 funds and other state and public dollars will be directed exclusively for public benefits unassociated with any regulatory compliance responsibilities.</p> <p>Additional priority restoration projects will be identified through regional and locally-led planning processes facilitated by the Delta Conservancy. Plans will be completed for the Cache Slough, West Delta, Cosumnes, and South Delta. Planning for the Suisun Marsh region is already complete and a process for integrated planning in the Yolo Bypass is underway. The Delta Conservancy will lead the implementation of identified restoration projects, in collaboration with local governments and with a priority on using public lands in the Delta.</p>
2993	1	<p>You can't create water by building tunnels. You can't store more water in dams if there is not water to put there. The California drought makes these tunnels useless except to cause more environmental degradation.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>This attempt to get more water is a fairy tale.</p> <p>Follow the science not the dirty money.</p>	<p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/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, Water Demand Management).</p>
2994	1	<p>We know better than to risk destruction of a critically important habitat and the species it supports in the interests of making money. I firmly believe that Southern California residents and Central Valley farmers need to find a solution to their water problems in efficiency and recycling. Thus the major benefit of this proposed project will be the transfer of billions of taxpayer's dollars to the builders and operators. That would be beyond scandalous. Too many people in a desert is a problem we don't solve by destroying a river and delta. This plan is too expensive and too costly to our environment. There are many associated costs not included in the proposal.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
2994	2	<p>Worst of all, we don't have the scientific analysis to show whether the project can be built without destroying the Delta. Obviously, sensible people do not proceed with a project under these conditions.</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>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
2995	11	No more fracking. Charge Nestles to pay for the water they steal and sell. Save lives, not farms in the desert.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project does not involve fracking. Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.</p>
2996	1	After 4 years of drought, water is more precious than gold. We need to plan the use of our water resources very carefully. The cost and so called benefits are unwarranted. The giant agribusiness corporations will be the beneficiaries at the expense of the public and the environment. Please abandon this program. It is very dangerous plan.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Please see the BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report (http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/Draft_BDCP_Statewide_Economic_Impact_Report_8-5-13.sflb.ashx), which indicates that the BDCP would result in a substantial net economic benefit to the State of California. An updated cost/benefit analysis is currently being conducted for the current preferred Alternative, 4A.</p>
2997	1	<p>There are alternatives for water conservation and usage that would not be so destructive. Are you familiar with the work that is being done by Columbia College? We need a revised, updated, innovative water usage plan that does not include dams, tunnels and California habitats.</p> <p>I am totally opposed to this plan.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 (Demand Management) for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>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>The California Water Plan's strategies are to be considered tools in a toolkit for water managers to choose from with the understanding that regional and local water managers have the best perspective on which strategy or strategies are most cost-effective and productive for meeting the needs and priorities of their region. Accordingly, the EIR/EIS does not include alternatives (including several that were proposed during the scoping process) that are equivalent to a statewide water plan or required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project. Many of the alternatives proposed for inclusion in the EIS/EIR but ultimately rejected because they address issues or apply to regions outside the Bay Delta, are nevertheless pertinent to</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			stewardship of California’s water resources and thus are appropriate for consideration in other regulatory or legislative contexts. For more information on the California Water Plan see Draft EIR/EIS, Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1.
2998	1	I think this kind of project is exactly the wrong approach to be taking. The planet is making it clear that we are not being good stewards.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the 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>
2999	1	As Conservation Chair, I and the over 100 members of the Delta Fly Fishers unalterably oppose the "California Water Fix". It will destroy the Delta. It will only continue public subsidizing wealthy southern San Joaquin Valley corporate farms in an unsustainable arid area. Public debt will be huge. Just remember Caltrans said the retro fit on the Bay Bridge would be only \$1.5 billion. It was \$6.5 billion and still has issues that will cost us more.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), and Master Response 5 (Cost).</p>