RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
300	1	I am the eldest daughter of commercial freshwater fishing parents. They took care of shad and clams. For 38 years they worked the Delta, raised a family of eight, and so we really relied on it. They were very much into conservation. We utilized the fish, the water sports, the boating activities. Our whole life centered around it, so it means a lot to us.	Please refer to Impacts 4, 5, and 9 regarding impacts to fishing.
300	2	I'm against the tunnels. I voted it down several times over the last 35 years, and it keeps popping up in conservation packages hidden. And I don't like that.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
300	3	The Delta is our water resource. I think that we provide a good percentage of the nation's crops. We feed the nation. And I don't see sending it down south to a desert area so that they can export crops. It just doesn't gel.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The SWP and CVP operations under the action alternatives would only deliver water under existing water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board to DWR and Reclamation for use by the SWP and CVP with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities, including operations to protect water quality, can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html).
301	1	I was a water works engineer for 40 years with Southern California districts and with Corps of Engineers across the street here. We couldn't get levees to stand up in the Delta structurally from an engineering point of view. I would love to know how they propose to put those tunnels in and have them resist earthquakes.	Please see Appendix 6A, Section 6A.3.4, FEIR/EIS, for information on seismic risks to the project, including measures to minimize and avoid potential impacts to water conveyance facilities. For more information on levee stability and seismic risk please see Master Response 16.
301	2	They also need to come up with something that actually describes the funding for the $65 billion that they need to do the tunnels.	The cost of the construction of the water conveyance facility and its associated mitigation will be paid by the participating state and federal water contractors. These water contractors will pay for the costs through water rate increases of their members and customers. Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			details on the cost estimates and cost controls.
301	3	The tunnels produce no new water.	The issues raised by the commenters address the merits of the project and do not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS documentation.
301	4	I'm also confused about just how they keep salmon out of the tunnels when they're in operation.	Each intake will be equipped with a state-of-the-art fish screen in combination with downstream flows that meet prescribed sweeping velocity versus approach velocity ratio requirements. For a description of screen design, please see Section 3.4.1, Overview of Water Conveyance Facility Components. For specific details, please refer to the July 2011 BDCP Fish Facilities Technical Team Technical Memorandum at: http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/Fish_Facilities_Team_Technical_Memo_Final_7_15_2011.sflb.ashx
301	5	I would also love to see more elaboration on the mitigation for the damage that it will do to the fisheries because there's nothing the Delta needs for fisheries more than water. If you take the water out up by Sacramento or Clarksburg, that leaves you with inadequate flows for every kind of fish in the Delta, not just the smelt but the salmon, the steelhead, and the sturgeon.	The potential effects and mitigation measures for the alternatives are described in the DEIR/EIS and RDEIR/SEIS; see, for example, for the preferred Alternative 4A, Chapter 4, Section 4.3.7 in the RDEIR/SEIS.
301	6	If they'll explain how they'll pay for it and how they'll mitigate the damage to the fish and why they're not allowing the public to vote on it like we voted on the Peripheral Canal. I mean that's the very first step, it should go to a bond vote and give us all a chance to vote against it like we did then.	Resource areas are addressed separately under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, public health, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible. The Cumulative Impact Analyses that was written for the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS has been revised to include the impacts associated with the new proposed project alternatives and also updates past analyses. Environmental Commitments are to minimize effects to the Delta and its inhabitants and mitigate for loss of habitat to the ecosystem and its species. For more information please see Section 5 Revisions to Cumulative Impact Analyses, Appendix A Chapter 11 Fish and Aquatic Resources, Appendix A Chapter 12 Terrestrial Biological Resources, and Appendix 3B Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs of the RDEIR/SDEIS. The proposed project is costly, but proponents have assessed the benefits as described in the BDCP funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			facilities. Expenditures of public money from other sources would be limited to restoration activities beyond those needed to mitigate the impacts of facility construction. BDCP Chapter 8, which deals with cost issues, and cost-benefit analysis information are available on the BDCP website. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on project costs and funding. For more information regarding impacts to aquatic resources and its mitigation measures please see Chapter 11 of the FEIR/EIS. For more information regarding Environmental Impacts please see Appendix 3B of the FEIR/EIS. The proposed project is costly, but proponents have assessed the benefits as described in the BDCP funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those facilities. Expenditures of public money from other sources would be limited to restoration activities beyond those needed to mitigate the impacts of facility construction. BDCP Chapter 8, which deals with cost issues, and cost-benefit analysis information are available on the BDCP website. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on project costs and funding. For more information regarding why the BDCP/California WaterFix differs from the Peripheral Canal please see Master Response 36.
302	1	I was against the Peripheral Canal 35 years ago. The Delta WaterFix--or the California WaterFix is a rehash of an old, old, antiquated and discounted plan. I have read chapter eight, water quality, in the new and revised EIR/EIS, and the biggest problem is there is still no mitigation for the salt intrusion and the damage to the Delta water quality that the tunnel program will create.	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. Further, mitigation for significant impacts to water quality identified in Chapter 8, Water Quality, has been included in the EIR/EIS.
303	1	I am opposed to the California WaterFix. The monetary cost is too high. Assumptions for the project were developed in 1912. They do not apply to 2015. Sixty-five billion dollars or more for water delivery in 24 years is not a good deal for the state.	DWR acknowledges your opposition to the project. Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on the costs of project implementation.
303	2	The environmental cost is too high. There is no water to flow through the tunnels. If we use the last four years as an example, no water would flow through the tunnels. And if we diverted the Sacramento River in these dry years, there would be multiple environmental consequences, one of which is drinking water, quality, and quantity, which would be	The preferred alternative, Alternative 4A, proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the preferred alternative would be roughly 10 percent more or equal to the average

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		significantly affected by these environmental costs with the California WaterFix.	annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the preferred alternative). Water quality standards would be maintained. Please refer to the description of Alternative 4A in Section 3.5.17 for more information.
303	3	Opportunity cost: California WaterFix sucks all the oxygen out of the room. The money, time and effort will be focused on delivering nonexistent snow melt into 24 plus years when we should be investing our money in regional self-sufficiency projects. Regional self-sufficiency projects help provide more supply through conservation and recapture in dry years, and they also provide mitigation of flood damage in the eventual flood years.	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 proposed project. 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. Please refer to Master Response 6for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.
304	1	I believe that since California is the world's fifth largest supplier of food and agriculture to the world and since the California central valley aquifer system is so seriously in crisis, depleted by over-usage, this five-year drought, and Southern California cries for more water, it only shows they will always want more. And we must protect our water and our Delta systems as well as our aquifers. No tunnels in California.	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. 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. 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.
305	1	I have lived on the California Delta for 42 years. I first would like to say that it was a stroke of genius to remove the name ''Peripheral Canal" and instead call it the "Bay Delta Conservation Plan." Most people, including myself, assumed that this plan would actually	For more information regarding how the proposed project differs from the peripheral canal please see Master Response 36. For more information regarding water demand management please see Master

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		help our Delta. It wasn't until today that I found out that the Brown Administration dropped the 50-year guarantee to restore the Delta's environment. According to the San Jose Mercury News, environmentalists say without that 50-year environmental guarantee up front in a legally binding document, promises to restore the Delta after the tunnels are built mean very little. Water policy advisor Jonas Minton said it reminded him of Wimpy from the old Popeye cartoon who used to say, "I will gladly pay you Tuesday for a hamburger today." Although the point is made with humor, there is nothing funny about what is going on in this state with regard to our water supply. Water supplies can be boosted with more conservation measures, more water recycling, drip irrigation, and many other ways.	Response 6.
305	2	I would ask that you please quit wasting the public's money by continuing to work on this potentially disastrous project, especially now that you have taken away our safeguards to protect the Delta. How can you do that? This project is not in the best interests of the birds, the fish, or the people who live near and rely on the California Delta for their survival.	DWR acknowledges your opposition to the project. This comment does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
306	1	The Miwok tribe are indigenous people that live by the river, and I just wanted to mention that the impact that this project will have on the rivers for the salmon life, the fish life, of all life, it's a great concern. And I feel that governor Brown, he doesn't take the indigenous people's voices into consideration while going through these issues. Last month we were closed out of a water summit wat the Westin Hotel in Sacramento, knowing that many of the indigenous people cannot afford $1500 to get in. But if we did get in, we weren't allowed to speak. So I feel that it's really important that the indigenous voices be heard on all these issues.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please see Master Responses 20 and 21 regarding cultural and tribal issues.
306	2	I ask that these can be prolonged to give people more time to go over these pages and pages of information. And I just would like to have them understand the impact that this is going to have on all life and the earth.	The comment period for the RDEIR/SDEIS was extended by 60 days. Please see Master Response 39 for more information about the public review period. In order to facilitate a more easy review of the changes in the RDEIS/SDEIS compared to the Draft EIR/EIS, a version of the document was made available that included hyperlinks and track changes, in addition to a Section 508-compliant version.
307	1	I'm from Walnut Creek, California. So the one thing I was wondering about is getting a contract for cleaning out the sediment	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		in the tubes. Because to me they look like two great big sluice boxes. They were used in the Gold Rush. And that the gold flakes will go to the bottom of the sediment and collect in the tubes or in the sedimentation ponds. And I'd like to see that that gold doesn't come into my little hands because if I get the contract -- because I would like it to be returned to the people of California because we're going to be needing to import a lot of water, freshwater, and we're going to need that money. You cannot drink gold dust.	
308	1	This project is neither environmental nor is it justice, and it certainly is not in the budget. I support the people of the Delta and their protestations, and I demand that the alternatives be implemented. The alternatives to draining water from the Delta must include mandatory drip irrigation for all the farmlands that use the water and exploration of all the possible safe environmental processes for conservation and--conservation, period.	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. 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. 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.
309	1	I'd like to see more attention to improving the current system of pumps, screens, diversions, and canals and less attention to a multi-billion-dollar project to junk the current system, spend what we need to fix what we have. With reduced future water supplies, we won't need more diversion projects or tunnels.	Screening the intakes at Clifton Court Forebay was analyzed during the water conveyance alternative development process and is described in the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS, Appendix 3A. This alternative was eliminated from further evaluation because initial results of recent studies, including information included in the recent NMFS biological opinions, supported a phased approach that would emphasize improvements to operations of fish handling facilities and reduced predator potential within Clifton Court Forebay prior to further analysis of installation of fish screens. Nevertheless, DWR and Reclamation will continue investigating strategies to increase fish salvage efficiency, reduce pre-screen losses, and improve screening efficiencies, consistent with the 2009 biological opinion of the SWP/CVP. The Proposed Project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the Proposed Project would be roughly 10 percent more or equal to the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.
310	1	I'm very concerned about the impacts of boating, among other things.	Discussions about impacts to boating under the preferred alternative, 4A, can be found in Impacts REC-3, 7, and 10 in Chapter 15, Recreation.
310	2	Imagine the construction--construction lights 24/7 and the noise of pile drivers and heavy machinery for ten years or more.	Mitigation measures NOI-1a and NOI-1b are available to reduce the effects of noise during construction. In addition to the above, DWR and contractors hired to construct any conveyance components of the project will implement a site-specific noise abatement plan to avoid or reduce potential construction-, maintenance-, and operation-related noise impacts. This section also includes environmental commitments to reduce noise levels where exceedances are anticipated to occur. Among these measures is a commitment to limit pile driving to the hours of 7 a.m. to 7 p.m.
310	3	Who is going to pay for this cleanup?	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. Please see Master Response 5 regarding cost and funding.
310	4	I'm concerned that the alternatives really haven't been looked at. For example, I talked to a fellow about boating impacts, and they said, yep, it's going to have a lot of negative impact and there's really nothing we can do about it.	For more information regarding impacts to recreation and its associated mitigation measures please see Chapter 15 of the FEIR/EIS. 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.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Well, I think something can be done, which is to seriously consider the alternative of no tunnel. I don't--I don't see anywhere where the alternative of no tunnel has been seriously looked at.	
310	5	The impacts of the construction of the tunnel will be significant.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Construction-related impacts are disclosed in individual resource area chapters in the EIR/EIS. All impacts would be minimized and mitigated to the degree feasible, as noted under each alternative in the EIR/EIS individual resource chapters and in Appendix 3B (Environmental Commitments) of the EIR/EIS.
310	6	The tunnels will produce no new water, it's just shifting water, and the water that will occur will be expensive water.	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. Deliveries to in-Delta senior water rights users are the same under the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and all action alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS in accordance with 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.
310	7	Questions are can the farmers afford such expensive water? How much will urban rate payers have to pay? And how much water does the Delta really need to survive? And I guess the bottom line is will the state conduct a full cost-benefit analysis of the project that includes the value of freshwater to the Bay Delta estuary?	Please refer to Master Response 5 regarding costs of implementation, and 39 for more information regarding funding for the BDCP. Please also refer to Master Response 3, Purpose and Need. Additionally, DWR is revising the Socioeconomic Impact Analysis for the project based on changes included in the Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS.
310	8	I also don't agree with the fact that--the environmental aspect of these dual parts, dual focus. It was originally always the ecological side and the water sustainability side. Because the Environmental Protection Agency said oops, this isn't going to work the way you think, they simply dropped the whole ecological side.	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 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. 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
310	9	So when the tunnels are built, it's going to create muck or you guys call it reusable tunnel material. I call it muck. Who's going to clean that up? I don't think that's been funded.	Please see Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, Section 3B.2.18.5, for a detailed discussion of measures that would be implemented for the disposal and potential reuse of reusable tunnel material, spoils and dredged material. Please also see Master Response 12.
310	10	We are thankful that the time to reply has been extended because there's a lot of new information.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
311	1	I have been working to fight the Delta tunnels project for over two years now as the campaign administrator for a grass roots campaign. A lot of my job involves trying to figure out ways to get the public to understand this project and the impact of it. Tunnel agencies have made sure to make this very hard for us. In the 1980s and the 1970s, the governor named this project the Peripheral Canal, and voters rejected it. Then the governor deceptively named it the Bay Delta Conservation Plan and more recently the California WaterFix. None of these titles help the public understand that this is a major project involving two gigantic tunnels. Even in the west and south central valley, where people are trying to over-pump the Delta, pro tunnel groups for agencies deceive their own farmers and farm workers by referring to the tunnels as a damn project or a water storage project. Pro tunnel agencies are fooling everyone in the state of California about this project. Their public hearings continue to be a show. There are no actual decision-makers at these hearings to listen to our concerns about our public health or economic future.	As state agencies, the Department of Water Resources and the California Natural Resources Agencies have an obligation to provide the public with educational information that is rooted in fact, based on reasonable assumptions supported by facts and expert opinions substantiated by facts. Doing so for a project of large scale and complexity can be a challenge. The BDCP website, blog, Your Questions Answered, and social media platforms have been the primary vehicle for communicating important project information and correcting misinformation. Brochures, factsheets, webinars and videos are other tools the State has employed to educate the public about the proposed BDCP and the EIR/EIS process. Representatives from the State have also held numerous meetings and briefings around the state to educate stakeholders and provide them with critical information about project developments and the EIR/EIS process. Brochures, factsheets, webinars, reports and other information is kept on the project website, www.BayDeltaConservationPlan.com and is available for review. Historical materials remain available for review and are labeled as achieved or superseded. For more information on the public outreach efforts made during the BDCP and EIR/EIS process, please see Chapter 32 of the EIR/EIS and Master Response 40. Refer to Master Response 36 for information on how the proposed project differs from the peripheral canal.
311	2	Many of us have bought homes here in the Delta and intend to raise families here. We are also intending to maintain these with stable jobs. But the tunnel project	When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		will destroy these opportunities for us. It will severely change the quality of life for people living here. Some of our cities, like Stockton, are already suffering from economic depression. This tunnel project, if it passes, will exacerbate all the issues we already have to sustain farming and create toxic drainage-impaired lands whose run-off only returns back into the Delta, where millions of people live next to the largest estuary. Yet, we will suffer the worst water contamination if these tunnels are built.	implementation of the alternative. 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. Please refer to Master Response 14 regarding selenium, mercury, and pesticides.
312	1	I am unalterably opposed to the tunnels. And I want to tell the Governor and the Obama Administration that this is five levels of crazy.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
312	2	There is no water to export. Who gets up in the middle of a four-year drought and says I've got the solution to California's water challenges; let's build a huge underground water tunnel large enough to fly airplanes through? If you haven't noticed, there is no water for the tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities, including operations to protect water quality, can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html).

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
312	3	Most of the water that is exported through the tunnels -- or would be exported through the tunnels -- is used for the wrong purpose. It is -- two thirds of that water is used for unsustainable farming, mostly for export, along I-5.	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.
312	4	The cost of the tunnels is unsustainable and unworthy of our investment of $70 billion and the debt for multiple future generations.	The project would cost approximately $15 billion to build. There would be additional costs for mitigation of approximately $800 million. Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on the costs of project implementation.
312	5	The tunnels will actually take away the money we need to spend on sustainable solutions that actually will solve California's water dilemma. The truly sustainable solution is to take that same money and invest it in local renewable regional water independence. Say, for example, capturing the ten percent of our water that is currently lost through broken water pipes throughout the state. That's a much better way to begin to solve our water challenge.	Although conservation components and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the BDCP or California WaterFix. 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, water recycling, etc. Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including storm water drainage. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. For more information regarding demand management please see Master Response 6.
313	1	California has cycle droughts; it's part of the state environment. And what I want to have on record is that there has been water mismanagement by the state government beginning most notably in 2011 and then into 2012. And so I challenge the review committee to replace the word "extreme drought" with "water mismanagement.'' Last year with violation of the Clean Water Act over 90 percent of juvenile salmon were killed because of the water being too warm.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal and State regulating agencies, ESA compliance, and project design. 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. The EIR/EIS evaluates long-term operation of the SWP and CVP over an 82-year long hydrologic period with extended wet periods and dry/critical dry periods. The evaluation is a comparative analysis to determine the incremental differences between conditions under the action alternatives and conditions under the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative. The analyses were not conducted to identify specific values or to respond to short-term emergency situations, such as the ongoing drought and recent operations of upstream reservoirs. Separate engineering and environmental studies have been and will continue to be prepared when changes in water quality and other criteria occur during emergencies.
313	2	The tunnels will not create one drop of drinking water for any Californian, and this is all going to venture capitalists farming in the desert. I urge you to take a good look at this and protect the Delta, the only natural estuary west of the Mississippi.	Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.
314	1	I'm 81 years old. And I was born in Courtland, California. I am a small landowner there in the Delta. I think that part of the great tradition of the American society is that of land ownership. It [has] instigated the spread of our American nation across the west by way of the Kinkaid Act and the Homestead Act. It goes back to the time when we shed our ties with England, when we became citizens, and also the right of land ownership. The new project will go right across my property and my children will lose all their inheritance and the productivity of the land forever. My problem is that that's all I have to give to my children. The idea of land ownership is sacred in our society of America. I think it should not be tread on lightly.	This comment expresses concern about loss of property associated with the California WaterFix conveyance facilities. DWR does not take the issue of Delta property acquisition lightly. The EIR/EIS discloses that approximately 76 structures could be affected by facility construction. Property owners affected by needed land acquisition would receive just compensation for the property acquired.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
315	1	Under ES123, refinements to Alternative 4, it states that habitat restoration in the Delta beyond these alternatives, mitigation requirements will occur separately through implementation of California EcoRestore, and these activities will be further developed and evaluated independent of the water conveyance facilities. This makes it very clear that the California WaterFix is an independent operation. As such, will probably be turned down by the Delta Stewardship Council [DSC]. Because a few years ago when the no-tunnel option was being considered, the DSC turned it down because it was not associated with the Habitat Restoration Program. Well, neither is Alternative 4A, the California WaterFix. So it has to be then turned down by the Delta Stewardship Council unless a little flimflam goes by on the side beforehand. Please look into this.	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. Proposition 1 funds and other state and public dollars will be directed exclusively for public benefits unassociated with any regulatory compliance responsibilities. 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. For more information regarding 4A compliance with the 2009 Delta Reform Act please see Appendix 3J of the FEIR/EIS.
316	1	Given the significant reductions in fish populations, how can we protect the fish if we take even more water? It seems to me like the tunnels are a bad idea for all of California.	The operational criteria included in the preferred alternative, 4A, is based on several years of coordination with fish agencies and incorporation of the best available science to avoid and minimize the effects of changes in Delta operations. No changes in water rights is proposed as part of the preferred alternative, 4A, and additional water would only be exported when it met the more stringent operational criteria included.
317	1	I'm a retired civil engineer with extensive knowledge in pipeline and tunnel design. I am concerned that the capacity of the tunnels will be oversized significantly, which will allow government agencies to pump more -- or allow more water to be sent south than is given in the documents.	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. Deliveries to in-Delta senior water rights users are the same under the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and all action alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS in accordance with existing water rights which were issued to

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The total amount of water exported by month in each water year type for each action alternative is presented in Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Model Results, of the EIR/EIS. As shown in Appendix 5A, Section C, the north Delta intake tunnels would not be fully utilized except for a few months in wet years. However, it is important to have 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 north Delta intakes would have minimal flows that would be required for maintenance of the pumps during critical dry years.
317	2	I'm concerned about surface damage to the grounds during construction. The number of vertical shafts required to construct the tunnels is not indicated. Access is needed at each of these vertical shafts for construction. This will have significant surface environmental damage, which is not discussed in the environmental documents.	Table 3.2-1 Summary of Physical Characteristics under Alternative 4, Section 3.2 of the RDEIR/SEIS provides the number of tunnel shafts needed. Also, Table 3C-32 Construction Assumptions for Water Conveyance Facilities by Alignment—Alternative 4, Appendix A of REDIR/SEIS provides additional details regarding tunnel shafts.
318	1	I have worked for 15 years on issues surrounding the American River, the lower American River in particular. So I'm here today as a member -- a board member of Save the American River Association. Here has been one of our questions all along regarding these tunnels. The issue evidently is not capacity. The canals are able to hold the amount of water necessary to deliver full contract water delivery when we have enough water. The issue is that the pumps with fish entrainment, et cetera. We know the pumps are not technologically up to snuff. There is a lot of things that can be done at the pumps to minimize the fish entrainment, to increase the efficiency of the pumps. Why then would we not work on upgrading those pumps as opposed to just trashing the entire system, going to all the expense and the environmental destruction? Work on those pumps and forget those tunnels. It doesn't make any sense. Doesn't make any sense from an economic perspective, from an environmental perspective. It really turns the tunnels into a boondoggle.	DWR and Reclamation are required to improve fish collection efficiency at the existing south Delta salvage facilities, as part of facility improvements required by the National Marine Fisheries Service 2009 biological opinion on the SWP/CVP. For example, in 2014 Reclamation replaced the secondary louver system with a traveling screen system. These screens provide protection by guiding fish into the holding tanks while catching debris on pegs and transporting debris to a collection system at the work surface. The technology required at the proposed north Delta intakes and the exisiting south Delta export facilities differ fundamentally. The north Delta intakes would be located on the side of the river channel and so would be desinged to comply with CDFW, NMFS, and USFWS fish screening criteria (BDCP Appendix 5B SEction 3.B.3.3). The south Delta export facilities are located on dead-end channels and requires active collection and salvage of fishes. Screening the intakes at Clifton Court Forebay was analyzed during the water conveyance alternative development process and is described in the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS, Appendix 3A. This alternative was eliminated from further evaluation because initial results of recent studies, including information included in the recent NMFS biological opinions, supported a phased approach that would emphasize improvements to operations of fish handling facilities and reduced predator potential within Clifton Court Forebay prior to further analysis of installation of fish screens. Nevertheless, DWR and Reclamation will

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			continue investigating strategies to increase fish salvage efficiency, reduce pre-screen losses, and improve screening efficiencies, consistent with the 2009 biological opinion of the SWP/CVP. For comments pertaining to the range of alternatives evaluated, please refer to Master Response 4.
319	1	The method of water management has been slanted. Too many times we have false science being thrown upon us and have seen cities, especially smaller cities, with their general population losing jobs, especially those who are not college-bound. We would like to see this end, and remember that the resources in the Central Valley and much of the population will never be college-bound, but they need viable jobs. They can't all be contractors.	Impacts to jobs, and types of jobs and workers, are described in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, under Alternative 4, Impact ECON-1. Construction employment is estimated to peak at 2,427 FTE jobs in year 3. Total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) would peak in year 12, at 8,673 FTE jobs. Direct agricultural employment would be reduced by an estimated 16 FTE jobs, while total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) associated with agricultural employment would fall by 57 FTE jobs. Based on the crop production values changes described in Impact ECON-6 for construction effects, the direct agricultural job losses would more likely be concentrated in the vegetable, truck, orchard, and vineyard crop sectors, which are relatively labor intensive, than in the grain, field, and forage crop sectors, where more jobs are mechanized. Because construction of water conveyance facilities would result in an increase in construction-related employment and labor income, this would be considered a beneficial effect.
320	1	I just want you to know how very unhappy I am about the tunnels. The first time I heard about the Bay Delta Conservation Plan, they thought it was a done deal. I mean they'd been working on it. They, being the Bay Delta Conservation Plan. They'd been working on it seven or eight years. They didn't have go to the people for a vote, even though this was a project that will destroy our Delta. It would just destroy it. I thought it's wrong. It's wrong. There are other ways. They've got the Edmund G. Brown and the Mendota Canals down closer to Tracy. They say they don't work, you know, this and that. Make them work. Fix it. You know, do something. Fix it. And make more storage. Granted, you know, we can't say, I would rather we divided northern California and southern California, but that's not going to happen. But to only look after or take care of the large water districts is not right. The tunnels are wrong. No matter what anybody says, the California Fix is a lie. There will be no more water. Granted, it will give some people jobs, but it's going to devastate the Delta. It will ruin it. You can't take the water away and think you're going to fix it when everything there needs water, you know. So anyway, I oppose it. It's wrong, and I hope it does not pass. No way. No how.	Please note that the project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole. Please also note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. The premise of the California WaterFix is that it will provide environmental benefits while stabilizing water supplies for a large population of California residents, consistent with statutory policy as found in the Delta Reform Act of 2009 (see, e.g., California Public Resources Code, §§ 85001(c), 85002, 85004(a), 85020.) Refer to Master Response 31 (Compliance with the Delta Reform Act). 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 Lead Agencies respectfully disagree with the general assertion that the documentation is fundamentally flawed as stated by the commenter. 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 [Transparency].

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
321	1	We (Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District [Regional San]) currently discharge secondary treated effluent into the Sacramento River approximately 12 to two miles upstream of the proposed intakes. We are in the process of upgrading to a tertiary treatment, and it is going to cost us approximately $2 million. We commented on the 2013 BDCP and related EIR/EIS, and it was lacking clarity in addressing impacts on Regional San's operation, our National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDS) permit obligation, and related water quality impact. Unfortunately, the 2015 version of EIR/EIS, and new alternatives, also lacks that clarity. We have to maintain a 14-to-1 ratio of river flow to our effluent discharge. When there is not enough flow in the river, when we cannot maintain that 14-to-1 ratio, we have to divert our effluent to our on-site emergency storage basin, which we have 302 million gallon capacity until the river flow is maintained, so we can discharge. We have submitted numerous models, expert analysis and comment letters previously. During our analysis, we have discovered numerous errors in the model and calculations of BDCP, and BDCP may have significant impact on river water quality, river ambient temperature, which can affect our NPDES permit obligation and other water-related issues. We encourage the BDCP and the new alternatives to fully identify the issues and must mitigate to Regional San's operation facilities, permit obligation, and water quality issues.	The EIR/S tables and figures only provided monthly flow data along the Sacramento River near Freeport based on the CALSIM II model results. Disaggregated data was calculated during preparation of the EIR/S using the DSM2 model to indicate changes during tidal cycles. The CALSIM II and DSM2 model results were provided to this commenter. However, it must be noted that the CALSIM II and DSM2 model results are to be used only in a comparative manner between model runs, and not to develop specific operational patterns. As shown in Figure 4.3.2-4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS, lower Sacramento River flow at Freeport would change minimally between Alternative 4A and Existing Conditions and the No-Action Alternative (NAA). Comparison to the NAA is most relevant because model runs for the NAA and Alternative 4A both incorporate key assumptions for climate change and higher water demands in 2025, whereas model runs depicting the Existing Condition do not. Hence, comparison of the NAA to Alternative 4A best identify the effects of the proposed project, and do not also include effects of future climate change and increased water demands. Flows at Freeport are critical to meeting Bay-Delta water quality and flow standards identified in the State Water Resources Control Board's D-1641 and thus will be maintained at levels that support implementation of Alternative 4A and compliance with D-1641 standards. Thus, conditions under which the SRWTP would be constrained at the 14:1 ratio are not expected to be more frequent with the implementation of Alternative 4A. In addition, lower Sacramento River water temperatures at Freeport are generally in equilibrium with ambient air temperatures and thus are not controlled at this point in the system by reservoir releases. This coupled with the fact that flows at Freeport would change minimally under Alternative 4A means that river temperatures at Freeport are expected to change negligibly (i.e., by only tenths of a degree), relative to temperatures that would occur at Freeport under the NAA. Regional San operates the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant (SRWTP) to the thermal limitations in the NPDES permit for this facility. Each of the NPDES permit limitations are stipulated as an allowable increase in river temperature (relative to background temperature) for 25% of the river cross-section or at the river surface, and a difference between effluent and river temperature. Compliance with the SRWTP thermal limitations is affected by the effluent flow:river flow ratio and the differential between the temperature of the effluent and the river background temperature. Where modeling shows that river flows would change negligibly, or not at all, under alternative 4A, relative to the NAA, such conditions would not adversely affect the ability of the SRWTP to comply with its NPDES thermal

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			limitations, relative to its ability to comply under the NAA. Likewise, because river temperatures at Freeport are expected to change negligibly, if at all, under Alternative 4A, relative to the NAA, such minimal changes in river temperature at Freeport would not substantially change the ability of the SRWTP to comply with its thermal NPDES permit limitations. Although minor changes in flows and river temperature would occur under Alternative 4A, relative to the NAA, they would not be of sufficient magnitude and duration to change Regional San's overall thermal compliance record relative to compliance under the NAA. Also, minor changes in river flow and temperatures that may occur under Alternative 4A, relative to conditions under the NAA, would not cause the Regional Water Quality Control Board to modify the thermal limitations in the NPDES permit or cause Regional San to build cooling towers to cool its effluent when such modifications would not be required under the NAA.
321	2	The new 2015 EIR/EIS lacks clarity on defining baselines for existing condition, new action, no action alternative, late long-term and early long-term. So we ask for providing additional clarity on those things and mitigating Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District's (Regional San) impacts.	The CEQA baseline assumes that the proposed project is not implemented, and reviews two scenarios: 1) consideration of existing conditions without the project, a "no build scenario" (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15125[a]) and is called Existing Conditions in this EIR/EIS; and 2) consideration of "reasonably foreseeable" future conditions without the project which is called the No Project Alternative in this EIR/EIS. This second scenario is equivalent to the No Action Alternative, identified below, and throughout this EIR/EIS, will be examined under that heading. The No Project Alternative allows decision makers to use the EIR to compare the impacts of approving the Proposed Project with the future conditions of not approving the Proposed Project in the year 2060. Under CEQA generally, the No Project Alternative may not be used as the sole baseline for assessing the significance of impacts unless the No Project Alternative is identical to existing conditions. (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6(e)(1).) As the NEPA baseline, the No Action Alternative, sometimes referred to as the future no action condition, considers no action conditions to include continuation of operations of the SWP and CVP as described in the 2008 USFWS and 2009 NMFS BiOps and other relevant plans and projects that would likely occur in the absence of the proposed project and which are well-defined enough to allow for meaningful analysis. The EIR/EIS has both NEPA and CEQA analysis with comparisons made against each respective baseline, with each separate require analysis clearly marked within each resource chapter. Where appropriate and where changes had occurred since the release of the Draft EIR/EIS that would result in a change in impact, baseline discussions were updated. Please see Appendix 3D, Defining Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, No Project Alternative, and Cumulative Impact Conditions, for more detail about how each of these conditions was defined. For additional detail about how the baseline was chosen, please see Master Response 1.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Please note that Alternatives 4A, 2D and 5A utilize a new NEPA baseline (No Action Alternative ELT) which examines baseline conditions approximately 15 years in the future
322	1	I am a second-third grade teacher. My farm is on Clifton Court, and it used to be a 3,000-acre farm. Now, it is about 600. The rest of it was taken for the Clifton Court Forebay. Our land is seriously impacted by the Clifton Court Forebay. It leaks. It has rodents. Then we have problem with all the water being taken south 15,000 cubic feet per second (cfs), whereas we take six cfs when we irrigate our crops. Because we have a farm, I have to work.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
322	2	We have seen first-hand when the California Water Project went in, and the amount of damage it has caused and the amount of fish that have been lost. It is just horrendous. ,, So I want to stop the tunnels. They are just going to add more. They are going to be taking up the tunnel point and at the Forebay. They are not going to help the Forebay, because they are going to continue to take. Right now we see when the gates are open, and they have been open since last July. So when there are tunnels, we will not know when they are taking water. It will be just whenever they want to -- the water will go. So that [stopping the tunnels] needs to happen.	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). The proposed project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports). Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Under the stringent environmental statutes in place today, including the Endangered Species Act, operation of the proposed water delivery system could not drain the Delta rivers and channels dry, including the Sacramento River. The proposed project's facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants, would be operated in accordance with permits issued by, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the State Water Resources Control Board, among other agencies. The proposed project 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards.
322	3	When the original California Aqueduct was built, it was built just before EIR and EIS went in around 1971. There has never been an EIR/EIS done. And every time we ask for one to be done, one to be taken, they tell us that, 'oh, it cannot because it has before.' Now, if I had a restaurant, if I bought a restaurant, and I wanted to open my new restaurant at a place that has been in business forever, I would have to bring it up to code. Well, this bringing in the tunnels is like bringing things up to code. We need to have an EIR/EIS on the entire project because that is what this is for. And we are not getting t that.	The lead agencies believe that the EIR/EIS is complete in their evaluation of impacts, direct and cumulative, that project description is complete and satisfies the requirements of NEPA, that the project objectives are also precise and complete and satisfy the requirements of CEQA. The lead agencies agree that the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS and 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS provided the public and decision-makers with sufficient information on which to make informed comments which have been considered and incorporated into the Final EIR/EIS.
322	4	We need 180 days of time. We started with a 45-day amount of time. We have gone up to 105. We need 180 days of comment just like we would have. This is a totally different document. We are not in the middle of the process. We are starting over again.	Please see Master Response 39 for more information about the public review period. In order to facilitate a more easy review of the changes in the RDEIS/SDEIS compared to the Draft EIR/EIS, a version of the document was made available that included hyperlinks and track changes, in addition to a Section 508-compliant version.
323	1	I am very interested in purchasing some property up there, and I am terrified. My thought is that, in addition to the water salinization and the effect on the businesses, the property values are also going to be very adversely affected with this. I do not want to spend $700,000 on a home now to have it be worth $500,000 when the water is ruined, and after the water levels go down in the Delta. They are talking about these tunnels costing probably $60 million or $60 billion, whatever it is, after all the overruns, because things never go the way they are planned.	Operations of Alternative 4 and the new preferred alternative, 4A, are not expected to result in a substantial decrease or increase in Delta surface water levels. Please refer to Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Modeling Results, EIR/EIS, for more information. For more information regarding socioeconomic impacts and its associated mitigation measures please see Chapter 16 of the FEIR/EIS. For more information regarding cost please see Master Response 5. The preferred alternative, Alternative 4A, would not contain significant impacts for electrical conductivity (EC), often referred to as salinity, related to objective exceedance in the Sacramento River at Emmaton, would not contain substantial degradation in the western Delta due to increased chloride concentrations, and would have less water quality effects in the western Delta related to EC and fewer exceedances of the fish and wildlife EC objective between Prisoners Point and Jersey Point. After introduction of mitigation measures, Alternative 4A, would result in less than significant impacts for EC and chloride. Please also refer to Chapter 8, Water Quality, regarding salinity or electrical conductivity impacts near Antioch, and Master Response 14 regarding salinity. Therefore, the preferred alternative, 4A, would be anticipated to result in

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			less than significant effects on fish and water quality related to salinity, which would result in less than significant effects on fishing from a recreation perspective.
323	2	I think that money would be much better spent on desalinization plants. That ocean is only going to be getting bigger and bigger, and that is all the water is coming in any way.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
323	3	I do not think we need more almonds, and I do not think we need more pistachios.	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.
323	4	I think that, unfortunately, Governor Brown, who I have been a big fan of for a long time, is being a bad boy. He is in the pockets of big agriculture, like the rest of the politicians. I am very disappointed.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
324	1	I want to go on record as opposed to the California Fix Project. I believe the damage to the environment and our Delta communities is the single most devastating disaster northern California could face.	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.
324	2	I am a property owner in Walnut Grove, as well as, Antioch, California. Not only are my concerns about the environment and the ecology of the Delta estuary, but how my personal water use will be affected.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the Clean Water Act as well as federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project proposes actions intended to provide for additional reliability, It is not anticipated that any individual's local water supply would be adversely affected by the proposed changes.
324	3	I have chosen to live in these communities for the last 40 years. I am a voter, I am a homeowner, and I am a property owner. I have made this my home, because I love the	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Delta. I do not believe our water should be stolen out from under us for commercial use.	
324	4	This is sacred land, historically important in the development of California, and one of the largest inland Delta anywhere in the western Americas.	Cultural landscapes are discussed throughout Chapter 18, including Rural Historic Landscapes in the Delta (Section 18.1.7.8). Direct effects of these cultural landscapes are discussed in Section 18.3.2 and Mitigation Measure CUL-6 includes following the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 CFR 68) and the National Park Service's Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes. Lastly, Mitigation Measure CUL-7 includes resource specific evaluation and treatment.
325	1	I am looking at all these plans and everything to take water away and, like the farmers, I am very concerned. I mean it is hard enough with the drought.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
325	2	They want to take fresh water, which has to be replaced with something, and that is going to be saltwater. So ,they plan on changing our agricultural area into a non-agricultural area. I like it the way it is, and I wish we could see more of it.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The SWP and CVP operations under the action alternatives would only deliver water under existing water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board to DWR and Reclamation for use by the SWP and CVP with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities, including operations to protect water quality, can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			permits (see http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html). The EIR/S modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.
325	3	I think all this money that is being spent on the tunnels would be better spent on creating two permanent solution, desalination units down south. That was an arid region to begin with historically, and now, they want to turn our area into -- what will probably become -- an arid region. It makes no sense, whatsoever.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
325	4	I am wondering how much money is going to be siphoned right off the top to line the politicians' pockets. This is just a ridiculous idea .	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.
326	1	Dredging is for flows and less leaks. Desalinization plus re-forestation with reservoirs and ground water for food crops in the most fertile delta soil in the world, not soil salinity. That was a brief objective. Now, stop expensive monstrous twin tunnels, the same size as the tunnel between Britain and England. That's along scenic Highway 160. The tunnels mean taking water from fertile soil deserts, housing developments, or fracking. Californians are productive with water for prosperity. On July 10th, 2015, the Central Valley Flood Protection Board had to report on 80 percent non-compliance. We can do that music comedian's punctuation mark for the apostrophe. That is for levee dredging maintenance for Sacramento Delta River. Dredging is for flow, cost effective and solves 75 percent of the issues as stated by a levee engineer, who said, he repaired all the levees over the years. He had more comments, but my time is limited. It was important. He said, soil actually purifies water with aeration and	The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7 regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 56 regarding water storage.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		absorption. Silt can be, you know, re-arranged and offered other ways. Desalinization has 15 points in California. 90 percent of Californians live 30 miles from the ocean, and we need to include Bakersfield Basin has other options besides taking our water. If diversion is for desert housing to fracking instead of Delta river farming, stop destructive dust-making twin tunnels and mudslinging by five to ten pumping intakes with the government diversions to a few in semi-arid or coastal regions.	
326	2	Governor Brown's legacy will be salt marsh or desalinization.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
327	1	In addition to being shocked by the price of the tunnels and the harm generally to the Delta, my specific comment goes to the placement of the three intakes within miles of each other between the towns Freeport and Courtland. These towns are--there's four towns altogether, Clarksburg, Freeport, Hood and Courtland, and they're connected by a scenic road in between them. The towns themselves are quite historical. They're involved [in] agricultural and recreational uses. The road itself is gorgeous. It has miles of the rive--the sparkling river being on one side of the river--or one side of the road with miles of pear orchards on the other, and now, recently, we've had wineries that have joined there. The three tunnels will go between the towns of Freeport and the town of Courtland. The board itself acknowledges that these towns will be destroyed in the making of the--in the construction of these three intakes during the construction period. That it will be complete destruction of the town, and complete economic destruction to them. Surely there has to be a better way than all of this. I also wonder whether anybody making any of these decisions has even bothered to get in the car and drive out and look at what they're about to destroy.	As identified in Chapter 17 (Aesthetics and Visual Resources) on page 17-2 of the RDEIR/RDEIS, the study area was surveyed during an initial site visit on January 9–11, 2012. During this survey, two hundred and fifty-five (255) cKOPs were photographed and a list of the cKOPs and their latitudinal and longitudinal locations are included in Appendix 17A. These locations are also mapped on Appendix Figure 17D-1. From the cKOPs, 72 KOPs were selected for use as representative photographs. KOPs were rephotographed on July 29-30, 2013, to show the same view but in the summer.
328	1	I'm very concerned about the salinity in my neighborhood after those tunnels are built. And I would like some kind of assurance from my government that my salinity and my property	The potential for water conveyance operations to affect salinity conditions in the Delta (including Suisun Marsh) under existing conditions and future no action conditions, and with implementation of each project

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		value will not be worsened by these tunnels. I've talked to everybody in this room just about, and nobody here can show me what document guarantees that the salinity in my water in my backyard will not increase at times because of the new tunnels. So I would urge the state to publish some kind of document showing that the water quality will not get worse and decrease my property values. And again I find it in none of the documents. And again I find it in none of the documents. Maybe it's buried there somewhere. I'm very much against this project because it could hurt me financially and certainly hurt California if the salinity levels do go up in the waterway here.	alternative (including conservation measures), is assessed in detail in Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the EIR/EIS for the salinity-related parameters bromide (Impact WQ-5), chloride (Impact WQ-7), and electrical conductivity (Impact WQ-11). Where significant impacts to water quality would occur due to the alternative, mitigation to lessen those impacts is provided. Socioeconomics are addressed in the EIR/EIS in Chapter 16.
329	1	I am a resident of Antioch, California, right off of the San Joaquin River, the heart of the Delta. The Delta is a real strong heart to me, and it just means a lot to the citizens of the area, because it is how we farm. We grow a lot of corn for the United States. If the tunnels were to be formed, the water from the sea would be sucked in. When that water is being sucked out to go to southern California to that Turlock station, the water that is going out is going to bring in seawater. It is going to be destroying our estuary, the fisheries that are barely even left, and the farming community with long generations of families. The canals are taking our water to southern California. I talked to a citizen of San Diego who said you guys are supplying all of our water because of those canals. I told him that we are getting totally tired of it.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The SWP and CVP operations under the action alternatives would only deliver water under existing water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board to DWR and Reclamation for use by the SWP and CVP with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities, including operations to protect water quality, can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html).
329	2	Desalinization plants are the answer. The by-product that is going into the ocean is horrible,	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		but we have to find a way of using that by-product. The concentrated salt that can mix with the seawater is killing the sea life. We have to find a way to use that concentrated salt in a different manner, like how engineers discovered how to create a solar-powered car, or Google creating the non-driver vehicle. I hear that desalinization plants cost so much money to run. Cover the canals that are taking the water right now to southern California with solar panels to pay for the desalination. It will reduce the evaporation from the sun, which is humongous.	regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
330	1	I have seen droughts come. I have seen droughts go. I have seen reservoirs that were empty one day, then completely filled two days later thanks to March Miracle rains. I have seen Bakersfield buried under dust. It is all because we do not have a stable, reliable year-to-year water supply here in California. When we draw water from the ground, some of it may filter back in eventually, and those aquifers may recover a little bit. But, for the most part, when we draw down the aquifer, it is not going to have anywhere near the capacity it did before. 100 years ago, the San Joaquin Valley and artesian wells would flow several feet high in the central part of the valley. That means that somebody would dig a hole in the ground, and there would be water spouting over their heads. That is long gone. Now, we have a certain water problem, and we have lots of people that need it. If we continue to draw water from primary river systems, and divert it around the estuary we call the Dekta, eventually what is going to happen is brackish water will come in from the San Francisco Bay, and vegetation will slowly die off. Once all this vegetation has died off (because there is not enough flow to carry out debris and poisons), it will all be dead. At that point, we might as well bring out concrete trucks, pave the whole thing over, and rename it the San Joaquin Pool.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The SWP and CVP operations under the action alternatives would only deliver water under existing water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board to DWR and Reclamation for use by the SWP and CVP with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities, including operations to protect water quality, can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html).
331	1	I am the vice-mayor for the city of Stockton. I am here, not only representing myself, but also the citizens of Stockton who live along the Delta.	The comment addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any environmental issue related to the RDEIR/SDEIS. Please see Chapters 11 and 12 of the Final EIR/EIS for analysis of potential impacts to aquatic and terrestrial species. Master Response 17 provides further discussion of effects on biological resources.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		I am also a high school science teacher, and my students are very, very concerned about not only the water but the wildlife specifically. We have insects, birds, and fish that depend upon the environment that is currently there. These tunnels will not sustain the lifestyle and the life that live there.	Please also see Master Response 24 for discussion of the effects on the Delta as a Place.
331	2	You can provide all the reports that you want, but there is nothing like actually living there. The salt water leaching in, and the chemicals that we will then be subjected to because of these tunnels, will be detrimental to not only our health but the health of what lives there in the Delta. It is my heartfelt plea that we look at alternatives outside of the tunnels.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues related to the RDEIR/SDEIS. Please see Chapter 8 of the Final EIR/EIS and Master Response 14 for discussion of water quality. See also Master Response 24 for discussion of the effects on the Delta as a Place.
332	1	My concerns are this study has not adequately addressed the possibility of creating new water storage or new water manufacturing. With current technology and future technology (which should be viewed), we should be able to create new water for California and new storage systems that will possibly, or at least more immediately, meet our needs rather than a tunnel that does not create one drop of new water for California.	Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the BDCP or EIR/EIS. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including storm water drainage. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.
333	1	I am against the tunnels. For one, of the devastation that it will do to the Delta with taking--diverting water from north and pumping it to the south. And, you know, with the pumping of the water that goes south, there will not be the hydraulics of flushing the Delta out of all the pervasive weeds that have started growing in there because of the drought and the lack of water flow.	By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. The proposed project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports). Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
333	2	I am against the tunnels because of the devastation it will do to Staten Island. I have worked on Staten Island for many years being a meter reader for the public utility here. It is a very unique area to where thousands and thousands and thousands of birds come and lay there over the winter or pass through, and it is a very necessary island. The Delta is very necessary for the flight plan of the migratory birds.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised. Refer to Master Response 17 for information on mitigation for terrestrial impacts. Please note that after the release of the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS the project was modified to minimize construction impacts on Staten Island by removing tunnel launch facilities, large reusable tunnel material storage areas, a barge landing site, and high voltage power lines.
333	3	I am just against the tunnels. I was against the Peripheral Canal when I was a kid. I'm against the tunnels while I'm an adult.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
334	1	I am the president of the Vista Del Lago High School fishing club. We are currently being affected by the drought at Folsom Lake, where we fish, which is pushing us back to the Delta. Now with the Delta tunnels being a possibility coming into the Delta, that would completely ruin our fishery. It would leave us with very little possibilities to fish around the area, which would ruin our club. We are very much against the tunnels, and "Save The Delta."	The proposed project would not decimate fishing opportunities. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required. Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need.
335	1	There are better choices than the twin tunnels to fix California's water issues. The California WaterFix is a bad plan for Californians. It is an expensive plan, without a vote of the people, and it does not make any more water for anyone. To work to stop this and change it into a plan that will work has been a full-time effort for me for the past six years. This plan needs to be stopped and real alternatives need to be vetted and seriously studied. Solutions are out there.	Please see Master Response 4 regarding alternative development. 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.
335	2	Agriculture uses 80 percent of the water in California now. Peter Gleick, a professor from the Pacific Institute, did a study about five years ago. When it was published, it concluded that if farmers would use drip irrigation where appropriate on their crops in California, we would save enough water to fill Hetch Hetchy Reservoir 16 times, every year.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
335	3	There is a concept of offshore desalinization using wave action that has great potential for new water. There are air-to-water generators being manufactured as we speak. They could be made on a large scale and be affordable. Every home could have their own potable drinking water made from the air.	Please see Master Response 7 for a discussion on desalination. The air-to-water generators mentioned in by the commenter are outside the scope of this project.
335	4	A scientist has even discovered a source of prime area waters deep in the earth It could be tapped.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
335	5	There are other answers. Not two tunnels that will devastate farms in northern California, and cause salmon and steelhead to become extinct. Jerry Brown, stop this madness and do the right thing. No water tunnels in California.	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.
336	1	I'm from Walnut Creek, California, and I'm very concerned about the Delta in terms of the hydrology as it flushes down the bay. If we have foul weather coming in from the ocean, the flush of the bay at ebb tide can keep that front from hitting us until the tide goes direct. Of course, any sailor needs to know this and count on it, so they get home safely. But what it means is that storms coming in will hit our Coastal Range harder and people that have houses on the denuded Coastal Range.	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 project and No Action Alternative would be less than under Existing Conditions due to climate change and sea level rise.
336	2	I have an orchard in Walnut Creek that's already getting brackish water and ground water, and that's killing the apricots. I have an orchard in Alameda County that is on the coastal mountain range.	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		And with the threat of water level rising and then more saltwater coming into the bay, I'm afraid I'm going to lose that orchard as well. So all these things are not being considered additionally.	Appendices 8E through 8N for specific results related to various water quality constituents (including 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. Please refer to Master Response 14, Water Quality, for more details regarding effects of the alternatives on salinity levels.
336	3	We know that the moisture in the ground lubricates the faults, so that we don't have big earthquakes. One of the reasons the 1906 earthquake was really big because it was at the end of a big drought. That's why it was so easy for the gold rush guys to find the gold. So this project, if it reduces the flow of water, not, you know, not the normal flow that they're counting on, but the flow that's going to exist when we have this huge drought that they're predicting that will start in five years, that that amount of -- that lack of moisture will help earthquakes happen. And we don't need that either, if it can be mitigated just by allowing the natural water flow to come down the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised. Please see Master Response 16 regarding seismic issues.
337	1	The state of California has oversold available water resources for decades. She has, in effect, been selling paper water; and with this drought, the chickens have come home to roost.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Water rights issued on rivers in the Trinity and Central Valley watersheds include a wide range of beneficial uses from hydropower to municipal, industrial, and agricultural water users. However, not all of the water diverted under the water rights is consumptively used. For example, water diverted for hydropower electric generation is fully returned to the water bodies; and a portion of the water diverted from municipal, industrial, and agricultural water uses is returned to the water bodies. In addition, the amount of water diverted is dependent upon water rights priorities and the need to meet environmental flow and quality requirements. Therefore, it is difficult to compare the total volume of water rights licenses to the total amount of water available in the system. For example, water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation are not fully available to provide water under the SWP and CVP water contracts in many years due to the demands of senior water rights holders and regulatory requirements.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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 project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS.
337	2	The Delta's smelt is all but extinct, and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Bay Delta chinook are on the precipice of extinction. Governor Brown's originally proposed tunnels would have devastated the remaining Delta fisheries, even with the full restoration program in the BDCP. Now that the restoration efforts, as called for in the state legislation, have been jettisoned, we are witnessing the beginning of the end of the native fisheries in this estuary.	The preferred alternative, 4A, was evaluated in this EIR/EIS and the evaluation does not show that the Delta fisheries would be destroyed. Impacts to listed species and their habitats will be avoided, minimized, or mitigated. The operational criteria included in the preferred alternative, 4A, is based on several years of coordination with fish agencies and incorporation of the best available science to avoid and minimize the effects of changes in Delta operations. Additionally, the EFH assessment and consultation will occur concurrent with the ESA Section 7 consultation and based on the evaluation in the Biological Assessment, impacts to commercial fisheries is not expected.
337	3	The state of California has all but abandoned the California Environmental Quality Act in its rush to approve the tunnels, first using the Delta Stewardship Council, and now, with an amendment that not only side steps the Delta Stewardship Council, but makes a mockery of the 2009 Delta Reform Act, (in quotes, "coequal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration while protecting the Delta as a place."). By revising the project, and adding 8,000 pages to the official record of 40,000 pages (a 20 percent increase in data by volume), you have drastically reduced the previously approved mitigation measures, which wasinsufficient at the time to save the Delta and her fisheries, and leaves the Delta chinook salmon nowhere to go but extinct.	Regarding the Delta Reform Act, please see Master Response 31. The California WaterFix (Alternative 4A) is now the preferred CEQA and NEPA alternative and does not involve preparation of an HCP/NCCP. Environmental analyses are focused on impacts of construction and operating conveyance facilities and implementing Environmental Commitments to offset effects of the conveyance facilities. Alternative 4A has been developed to benefit fish and wildlife species and improve water supply reliability. Under ESA Section 7, the project has been developed to ensure it would not jeopardize the continued existence of ESA and CESA listed species. Other actions that are included in the BDCP alternatives such as large scale habitat restoration are not part of California WaterFix but are instead being implemented separately under the California EcoRestore program and the California Water Action Plan.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
338	1	Gary tucker, who is standing behind me, spent an hour asking consultants today if more water would be taken from the Delta with the Delta tunnels and if there would be greater saltwater intrusion in Discovery Bay. Every consultant downstairs told him that that would not happen, that the water would not salt up, water quality would be fine, and additional water would not be taken from the system. However, the EIR shows that there will actually be more water taken from the system, and there will be significant water quality impacts that are hidden in the appendices throughout the 48,000 pages. That's the original plan. The first EIR and the revised EIR.	The potential for water conveyance operations to affect salinity conditions in the Delta (including Suisun Marsh) under existing conditions and future no-action conditions, and with implementation of each project alternative (including conservation measures), is assessed in detail in Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the EIR/EIS for the salinity-related parameters bromide (Impact WQ-5), chloride (Impact WQ-7), and electrical conductivity (Impact WQ-11). Where significant impacts to water quality would occur due to the alternative, mitigation to lessen those impacts is provided.
338	2	We are highly disturbed that the proponents and BDCP consultants are not being honest with the public about the impacts of the project. We are upset that today at the Metropolitan Water District for their Bay Delta hearing, they had a PowerPoint that showed with the Delta tunnels, they will have additional significant amounts of water during critically dry years like this year.	For more information regarding MWD water supply, please see Master Response 35. For more information regarding the transparency of the project and communications, please see Master Response 41. For more information regarding public outreach efforts, please see Master Response 40.
338	3	People selling the project to the public are not being honest. It will destroy water quality for 4 million people in the five Delta counties. It has to be stopped.	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.
339	1	I want to give a comment on behalf of the Restore the Delta, and I want to speak on behalf of the environmental justice community. I feel that there is no appropriate information given out in various languages to the communities that represent the Delta Region, and the various counties of Sacramento and San Joaquin Counties. We need to make sure that the communities whom fish and live in the Delta are able to have access to the public report, that is made out in means of the 40,000-page document. I feel that it is a disservice to our communities [our EJ communities] in not being able to give them the information in order for them to make adequate decisions and know what is going on with their communities. My family has been in the area for over three generations and were unaware of what was taking place, and they speak English. So for those who do not	Please refer to Section 28.3 in Chapter 28, and Chapter 32, Public Involvement, regarding public outreach and language accessibility. More than 22 scoping meetings occurred between 2008 and 2009. Twelve public meetings occurred in 2014 regarding the Draft EIR/S. Two public meetings occurred in 2015 regarding the RDEIR/SDEIS. Additionally, the following summary of outreach activities and strategies, consistent with EO 12898 and the obligations described under Section 28.4, Regulatory Setting, including Reclamation's NEPA guidance in the Draft NEPA Handbook requirements, presents how scoping and other outreach considered minority and low-income populations. These activities included the following. Providing notification and announcements of scoping meetings in ethnic newspapers on ethnic radio stations. Conducting scoping meetings within affected communities during evening hours in an effort to involve

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		speak English, I think it is a very difficult situation.	low-income and minority communities outside of working hours. Providing translators at public scoping meetings. Providing the BDCP project Website in Spanish. Providing a multi-lingual information hotline for project information in English, Spanish, Tagalog, Vietnamese, or Chinese (Mandarin).
340	1	I really cannot believe that this project has even been proposed and why it is still on the table. I find it very absurd and preposterous that such a calamity of ideas would be thrown together to create a Bay Delta Conservation Plan, which is a disaster plan. I cannot believe all these people in this room support it. I really do not know how any logical person, who thinks and uses their head and uses common sense, can think that this can be a good project. It is absolutely ridiculous. I cannot -in fact, I cannot believe it. I just cannot believe it. There are a lot of bad things going on in the world right now, a lot of wars going on. Many people are starving. Lots of terrorism. Why do we have to have one more ridiculous thing going on. This is totally absurd.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
340	2	The cost -- the cost in money alone is enough. If California really knew what it [Water Fix] was going to cost, more people would be out here protesting this thing. They estimated in the ten, 12, $15 billion, but I have heard more realistic figures like in the $60 billion range. And I just cannot see how -- I do not want to pay that, and other taxpayers in California do not want to pay it. Our future generations do not want to have to pay that.	DWR acknowledges your opposition to the project. Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on the costs of project implementation.
340	3	The Water Fix is going to ruin the state. It is going to deplete water resources. They'll be able to take as much water as they want out of the Sacramento River. And it will ruin the natural ecology of the freshwater coming through the Sacramento-San Joaquin. And the Sacramento River is not just one river. It's a combination of many rivers flowing into	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Operation of the 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 project only would be permitted to

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		that river. So it isn't one river. It is many rivers. And when we take that away, we take the lifeblood out of the state. People in this room do not know what kind of harm it's going to do. It's ridiculous.	operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities, including operations to protect water quality, can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html). The EIR/S modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.
340	4	People need water. We all need water. We need to share the water that's in the state. Unfortunately, this plan does not allow for saying where the water will really go. I'm all for the water going for the urban cities down to the south, Santa Barbara, San Diego, L.A., San Luis Obispo, provides water to many places. And I support it for some agriculture but not to the extent of agriculture -- big agri business, which consumes probably most of the water out of the California Aqueducts and for unsustainable crops, like almonds that get imported to China.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Operation of the 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 project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities, including operations to protect water quality, can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html). The EIR/S modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
340	5	This is a nice idea, but we simply do not have that much water. We need to make sure that everybody gets water, not just the privileged few. And that people do not abuse their water rights whether they're senior, junior or anything. They need to revamp the water regulations in the state, so that it's a fair system. I do not believe that it's a fair system now, and I do not believe that this plan is going to alleviate that.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. No response is required.
340	6	We need a plan that has logic and science. We have all those things at our fingertips. Let's use it. Let's do something that makes sense, not this ridiculous idea. And I'd like to know who originally thought of this idea. Was it Bozo or Goofy?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
341	1	I do not have a prepared statement, but I am down here today, on a very hot day, at the end of a day of work, because I am distressed about the forward momentum on the tunnels plan. I do not support it. I have been a long-time Jerry Brown supporter, and I am a California native. At first when I heard about the plan, I made a lot of assumptions about it being the right thing to do because I put a lot of faith in Jerry Brown's environmental priorities and record. But the more I have read, the less confident I feel. I am dismayed that he is pushing the plan as hard as he is. It seems to provide, essentially, profit for the few at a great economic and environmental expense, especially in the Delta area.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
341	2	I am especially concerned about what I perceive to be ruinous environmental consequences to this plan.	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.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
342	1	We don't really need this project. This plan is an extension of a plan they started back in 1960 and promised to provide protections for the Delta, water quality and for fish. Well, they failed to do that, and they spent the money on other things.	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.
342	2	They're now telling us we need this project, and I'm saying we don't. Because if they take out another 140,000 acres of farmland for wetlands restoration, that will give them about 2.8 million acre-feet or as much as 3 -- excuse me -- 280,000 to maybe 350,000 acre-feet of additional water. The department needs 450,000 acres. Okay. That's what they need to firm the yield up. So if they take those lands out, and they already have 100,000 acres in state ownership. That means then they have 240,000 acres. Do the math. That's three acre-feet per acre, and you find that they're right at the 450,000 that they need. So we don't need an additional project. We don't need tunnels. We don't need reservoirs. We've got to stop expanding agriculture. You know, from 2002 to 2012, almonds alone increased by 40,000 acres a year. And in 2002, it was 440,000 acres. Then in 2012 it went to 880,000 acres. That requires about 3.7 million acres feet of water to do that. That's -- Metropolitan Water District in southern California only provides 2.1 million acre feet to all their customers. So people are taking out their lawns, and they tell us we've got a crisis when the State Water Project in the last four years, you know, from 2011 to 2014, they ship more water south than they had in the previous four years. So the department is the one that's writing this report. They're the ones that are the broken promises, and we can't expect them to come up with the solution to the problem. And the reason why, they're the problem.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
343	1	Are there any maps/figures that show the detours around the Highway 160 intake sites? Please send me the link.	The lead agencies acknowledge your concern about detours around the Highway 160 intake sites. There are no figures or maps showing route detours at this time. Detours will be addressed during creation of detailed traffic management plans as discussed in Mitigation Measure TRANS-1A.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
344	1	As a longtime Delta-area resident, I would like to express my very strong opposition to this twin tunnel project to ship water to southern California. We have recently had ocean salt water push back usable Delta water several miles due to less good water outflow to keep it back. Shipping our water south will not solve the problem; the north [does not] have enough now for the farmers, home plants and trees, or fish and wildlife habitat. Shipping south will only worsen it badly.	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. 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. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented California WaterFix project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Please also refer to Master Response 14 (Water Quality), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use), Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports/Area of Origin/Water Rights), Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply), and Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place).
344	2	The tunnel money would be far better spent building ocean water desalination plants. California is one of the lucky states with coastline our entire length [to] desalinate as much water as needed north, south, and all in between from now own. If there was sufficient rainfall we would not need to take ocean water that year.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
344	3	Causing problems for one part of the state to send their water to another seems very unwise. The damage to the ecosystem in the north could and would be possibly unrepairable and very costly in lost food production and the general economy.	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.
344	4	Please do not pass this twin tunnels project. This very, very expensive plan that taxpayers will have to support seems like robbing Peter to pay Paul with poor, poor results, not fully	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		solving the problem for either and causing lots of citizen anger and resentment. [Let us] put that money where it will give long-lasting water supply without counting on the rain.	the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.
345	1	The environmental provisions have been changed -- this is wrong. I would like to request a 180 day review. The "twin tunnels" is a serious problem for many. A simple 45 days comment period is inadequate. Please extend that comment period to 180 days.	The comment period for the RDEIR/SDEIS was extended by 60 days. Please see Master Response 39 for more information about the public review period.
346	1	I oppose the twin tunnel project. If this project goes ahead I see damage to the Sacramento, Mokelumne, Cosumnes and San Joaquin Rivers. Vital flows through the already stressed Delta will be diminished. Native salmon runs, already at all-time lows, will be further diminished if not wiped out. This project will greatly diminish if not destroy the Delta's agricultural industry, sport fisheries and overall economic prosperity. Dress it up anyway you like (Delta Bay Conservation- are you kidding me?), this a blatant water grab. Californians have already managed to hit the conservation mark. Let's try more of that before billions are spent on this boondoggle.	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. Please see chapter 15 for a discussion on impacts to recreation. Impacts to agriculture are identified and discussed in Chapter 14.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
347	1	These tunnels are a knee-jerk reaction to a complex problem. The feeling that we need to do something is strong, but we don't need to do something wrong! Please stop the tunnel plan.	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.
348	1	My husband and I are very opposed to this latest plan to fix the Delta and build the twin tunnels to supply water to Southern California. Instead of building these tunnels which would destroy the fragile ecosystem of the Delta, we should be concentrating on desalination plants and other water-saving measures that will help all of us to ensure enough water for us and for future generations. With climate change raising the sea water levels, it makes sense to use the rising water levels to our advantage. Furthermore, suppose the drought situation is here to stay. What good will those tunnels do if there's not enough water to ship south? Building the tunnels will hurt the Delta and Northern California.	California WaterFix would help to address the resilience and adaptability of the Delta to climate change through water delivery facilities combined with a range of operational scenarios, measures focused on the protection, restoration, and enhancement of the Delta ecosystem and measures to reduce other stressors (Environmental Commitments 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, and 16). In Multiple analyses were performed in the proposed project to test the robustness of the alternatives to a range of potential future conditions. Water supply, aquatic and terrestrial resources were all analyzed with projected future conditions. The proposed project will likely remain in place and functional far into the future when salinity intrusion may require less frequent use of the south Delta pumps. Far from being stranded assets, the tunnels will be part of the state's strategy in adapting to climate change. 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 A RDEIR/SDEIS and Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS (in appendix A). For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
350	1	Att 1: Beginning in the 1960s, San Francisco Bay progressed from an odiferous garbage pit to a scenic bay with clear water, attractive public recreation areas, and improved bird and mammal habitat. The change was made possible by local public support with aid from state and federal agencies. However, the aquatic life, once characterized by huge salmon runs,	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in the comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		and productive fisheries for sardines, herring, sturgeon, striped bass, oysters, and shrimp, has failed to respond. We now have only small remnants of those once abundant populations. The bay still has contaminants that date from the garbage pit days, but they are evidently not the primary factor that has prevented aquatic recovery. As the human population has grown larger so has the sport fishing pressure. Consequently, large-size predators are few with little influence on the lower trophic levels. In order to permit a recovery of the aquatic ecosystem, it is recommended that a substantial part of the bay be designated as a no-take, marine protected area (MPA) where the apex predators can grow to their optimum sizes and can influence the establishment of a more productive ecosystem. The ecology of the bay would benefit from a plan to divert water southward from the Sacramento River instead of the Delta.	
353	1	RDEIR/SDEIS does not appear to contact an Environmentally Preferred Alterative that is required under CEQA Guidelines 15126.6(e)(2) and NEPA. The tribe would like to be allowed to microsite or get other design features incorporated to reduce the potential for direct cultural impacts.	Please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. An environmentally superior alternative has been identified in the Final EIR. Please also refer to Master Response 4 regarding how the alternatives were selected and evaluated.
353	2	UAIC [United Auburn Indian Community] left out of RDEIR/SDEIS analysis as Tribe, government or partner. There is no discussion of the Tribe/tribal values in areas of controversy, construction timing, project and alternatives screening criteria (i.e., a tribal burial mound avoidance alternative), environmental commitments for cultural resources, social effects, environmental justice or identified as a viewer group for visual impacts. The UAIC requests to be allowed to participate in the RDEIR/SDEIS analysis.	DWR has hosted meetings with the tribal community throughout the Plan Area. An informational meeting was held in Sacramento in December 2013. This meeting was followed by regional consultation meetings held in Corning in April 2014, in Sacramento in June 2014, and in Clovis in June 2014. Consultation is on-going. In July of 2015, DWR continued outreach to the Tribes to assess interest and provide updates on the proposed project changes. DWR has also held an informational meeting on August 12, 2015. DWR has solicited input from Tribes on the consultation process, including the potential development of a Tribal Advisory Working Group for the proposed project.
353	3	On Alternatives, it appears that very little consideration was given to any others. The rationale for rejecting other design features and preservation in place falls short of what the United Auburn Indian Community considers a minimum level of effort. The Tribe requests a complete and full analysis of such preservation in place and avoidance alternatives as alternative citing locations for the intake tanks. The fact that the project is being approved with not adequately identifying all known resources and a finding of no adverse effect is of concern to the UAIC [United Auburn Indian Community].	Cultural resources within the proposed project area are discussed in Chapter 18 of the Draft EIR/EIS, RDEIR/SDEIS, and Final EIR/EIS. The discussion identifies known resources and provides that preservation in place, where feasible, is the preferred treatment of cultural resources, in compliance with CEQA. DWR will work with tribal communities during construction to protect tribal cultural resources. For additional information regarding cultural resources, please see Master Response 20. For additional information regarding the formulation and selection of alternatives for evaluation in the EIR/EIS, please see Master Response 4.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
353	4	If the USACE materially revises any section of the RDEIR/SDEIS then the document should be recirculated. USACE shall evaluate, determine effects, and develop treatment before the project construction activities begin. The tribe does not consider data recovery, curation and testing/analysis appropriate which is in fact a negative effect and direct impact to the cultural resources. The RDEIR/SDEIS addresses solely scientific archeology, there is zero discussion regarding tribal cultural values, sanctified cemeteries, or cultural landscapes. Include a section on why preservation in place is a feasible alternative. RDEIR/SDEIS does not admit that human remains could be impacted and that state law would be followed.	Cultural resources within the proposed project area are discussed in Chapter 18 of the Draft EIR/EIS, RDEIR/SDEIS, and Final EIR/EIS. The discussion identifies known resources and provides that preservation in place, where feasible, is the preferred treatment of cultural resources, in compliance with CEQA. DWR will comply with all state law concerning the discovery and protection of human remains. For additional information regarding the adequacy of the cultural resources impact analysis, please see Master Response 20.
353	5	Will any new sections on PG&E utility relocation be in the RDEIR/SDEIS? Especially of this work includes use of cranes, land leveling, poll removal and relocation, tree replanting and vegetation removal - all activities that could have significant impacts on cultural resources.	Final powerline relocation will be determined during the design phase. During relocation of the utilities Mitigation Measures CUL-1, CUL-2, CUL-3, CUL-4, CUL-5, CUL-6, and CUL-7 will be utilized to minimize impacts on cultural resources.
353	6	The cumulative impact section is wholly deficient and also contains improper analysis such as cultural resources are typically not subject to cumulative effects which is unsupported in CEQA/NEPA. Yet RDEIR/SDEIS then admits impacts are cumulatively significant but then offers no mitigation for that impact. Again, there is no mention of tribes or cultural landscapes, the latter is especially relevant when dealing with cumulative effects or effects across several phases or projects over wide geography.	The cumulative impact analyses that was written for the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS has been revised to include the impacts associated with the new proposed project alternatives and also updates past analyses. For additional information regarding cumulative impacts and requirements for their assessment under CEQA and NEPA, please see Master Response 9. For information regarding the adequacy of the cultural resources impact analysis, please see Master Response 20.
353	7	Specific borrow and staging sites were not identified in the RDEIR/SDEIS, it is not appropriate to recommend cultural resource areas for these types of activities.	In the final EIR/EIS, Chapter 18, Section 18.2.1.3 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.
353	8	Will there be a section on Wetland delineation?	A wetland delineation was completed in early 2015 and verified by USACE. Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS presents and discusses impacts on wetlands. Mitigation Measure BIO-176: Compensatory Mitigation for Fill of Waters of the U.S. provides mitigation to compensate for those impacts.
353	9	Will the project be avoiding FEMA [Federal Emergency Management Agency] land use restrictions and are barges included in the project - use of barges could help to reduce impacts on cultural resources?	Please refer to Chapter 6, Surface Water, Impacts SW-2, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 9 regarding flood conditions. All impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Barges would be used in the proposed project. Temporary barge unloading facilities would be built on the following waterways: Snodgrass Slough, Potato Slough, San Joaquin River, Middle River, Connection Slough,

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Old River, and the West Canal, as described in Impact REC-3.
353	10	Other interesting points, United Auburn Indian Community would like to discuss are: -Admits no further federal action assumed, raises question of whether feds could assume the project without reopening the environmental review; -No analysis of vibration or compression effects on project on cultural resources; -No analysis of vegetation impacts that relate to native or cultural plants including those that might have been part of the burial mounds or part of the tribal cultural landscape; -Will there be conservation bank purchased for giant garter snake - why not for cultural landscape; -Please note that post approval technical studies are not okay; -No section in climate change discussing whether it makes sense to consider alternative to proposed intakes; -No text references to NPS [National Park Service] Bulletin 38 (TCPs) or ACHP [Advisory Council on Historic Preservation] guidance on cultural landscapes, document takes a very stilted view of what Section 106 means. We understand this may be in the RDEIR/SDEIS, yet to be developed, but it would be good to include the important of place, setting, landscape, to the Tribe; -NAHC [Native American Heritage Commission] is not listed as a trustee agency.	Please see response to comment 353-4 and Master Response 21 that discusses measures to protect tribal cultural resources and ongoing discussions with Tribes. These points may also be addressed in the ongoing government-to-government consultation. Ongoing discussions with Tribes about their concerns are addressed in Master Response 21.
353	11	United Auburn Indian Community will also be submitting additional comments and would like to schedule field visit and a government to government meeting to discuss this project. Please provide some possible dates. If possible we would also like to meet with DWR and the Bureau of Reclamation.	DWR and the Bureau have engaged in outreach and consultation with Tribes. DWR and the Bureau consider the consultation ongoing and intend to have additional government to government meetings to discuss the project and resolve any concerns.
354	1	It is time for those in the wine, meat and dairy industries [to be] held accountable. We are to blame for allowing so much pain and suffering in the animal industry and for allowing the	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many 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
		greed of the alcohol business to destroy our trees and habitat for their lust for wine.	Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
355	1	Additional reservoirs need to be built so our rain [does not] run off into the Pacific.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the BDCP/California WaterFix or FEIR/EIS.
356	1	I am writing to express my strong support for building water desalinization plants along our ocean beaches instead of funding the expensive fast trains. Israel has done this, and we should too.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
357	1	The recovery of wetlands will be helpful in the event of seismic event-caused flooding, as well.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II 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 originally proposed habitat restoration measures and related Conservation Measures (CMs) (i.e., CM2 through CM21) would not be included as part of the Proposed Action, except to the extent required to mitigate significant environmental effects under CEQA and meet the regulatory standards of ESA Section 7 and California Endangered Species Act (CESA) Section 2081(b). However, restoration actions that are independent of Proposed Action will continue to be pursued as part of existing projects and programs. Examples of these include the 2008 and 2009 USFWS and NMFS BiOps (e.g., Yolo Bypass improvements and habitat enhancements, 8,000 acres of tidal habitat restoration), (2) California EcoRestore, and (3) the 2014 California Water Action Plan.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Please see Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, of the FEIR/EIS for discussion of potential consequences of an earthquake to exports under a No Action scenario. Please see Master Response 16 for more information regarding seismic impacts.
359	1	This needs to be finished before the next drought cycle and to help restore the fisheries by moving the diversions to get the people that are paying for the flood control dams the water they were promised as part of the payment for those dams.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The comment recommends that the project proceed quickly. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
361	1	How will tunnel construction over a 14 year period be at all helpful or preventative of drought?	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. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
361	2	How does a Delta tunnels-only project and less than 2000 acres of mitigation habitat comply with the 2009 Delta Reform Act "coequal goals" of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration while protecting the Delta as a place?	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			purpose and need behind the proposed project. For more information regarding the proposed project's compliance with the Delta Reform Act please see Master Response 31 and Master Response 24 (Delta as A Place).
362	1	No to the tunnels. The governor is wrong, this will destroy the Delta and he knows it.	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.
363	1	The May 5, 2015 Contra Costa Times Editorial stated: "Gov. Jerry Brown has abandoned any pretense that his massive Delta twin-tunnel project could benefit the environment, leaving it simply as one of the biggest water grabs in state history." Governor Brown has disingenuously abdicated his responsibilities to California and all of its citizens in favor of the biggest billionaire agricultural king in the nation. Discovering all of the deceits and defects in the Governor's latest plans for destruction of the Delta will take much more time than the 45 days he would like to allow.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The 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.
368	1	Changing the name from twin tunnel project to the Delta WaterFix does not change the environmental issues and the impact that it will have on the local communities, farmers, and boaters along the Delta. We have water shortages and fines now. Massive tunnels will take more of our water away.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II 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 Lead Agencies discuss community character in Chapter 16 of the EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A (Socioeconomics) identifies the unique features of the Delta and describes the potential effects on Delta communities. Please see chapter 15 for a discussion on impacts to recreation. Impacts to agriculture are identified and discussed in Chapter 14; project proponents have proposed measures that would support and protect agricultural production in the Delta by securing agricultural easements and/or by seeking opportunities to protect and enhance agriculture with a focus on maintaining economic activity on

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			agricultural lands. Please see Master Response 18 for more information on agricultural mitigation.
369	1	This plan will not add one drop of water to fight the droughts that California will continue to face. People may actually be misled by the term "water fix" to think that the plan will produce more water for California--which is untrue. What we need is storage--in the north and down the valley--so that in wet years we can prepare for those drought years. This plan will not prepare us in any way to capture that water.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project also 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 proposed project would convey water during extremely wet periods to areas south of the Delta for storage and use during drier times. The north Delta intakes would have minimal flows that would be required for maintenance of the pumps during critical dry years. Future reservoir projects are still undergoing evaluation or review, including potential reservoir projects. Therefore, potential reservoir projects are only considered in the EIR/S as cumulative impact projects (please see Master Response 37). The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change with continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.
369	2	This plan would divert the water flow that flushes through the Delta during the wet part of the year. This flush has historically maintained the health of the Delta. In fact, EBMUD is required to release precious water from May rains to help flush the Delta, even in drought years. Salt water intrusion is a concern even now. With the water removed upstream by the tunnels, it will be an even bigger problem. There is no "fix" to replace the natural flushing.	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.
369	3	We live close enough to be concerned about a salt water problem in our wells since our aquifer is replenished by the Sacramento and Mokelumne Rivers.	The EIR/EIS modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the project, due to the reduction in rainfall and increased sea level rise, western Delta salinity could become greater than under the No Action Alternative and action alternatives. Water would be released from the SWP and CVP

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			reservoirs to reduce the Delta salinity, however, in some years, adequate water supplies may not be available to reduce the surface water salinity, as described in Chapter 8, Water Quality. In those times, groundwater salinity under adjacent Delta islands also could increase. This would occur with or without the Proposed Project. Effects due to climate change are provided for informational purposes only and do not lead to mitigation. None of the action alternatives changed the flow or diversions along the Mokelumne River as compared to the No Action Alternative. This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. However, a modified Proposed Project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) also is being considered to provide modified conveyance facilities for the SWP and CVP and does not include large-scale habitat restoration. Please see Master Response 5 related to the status of the BDCP and Master Response 8 related to analysis of Alternative 4A. Without implementation of large-scale habitat restoration, the effects on salinity under the action alternatives as compared to the No Action Alternative would be less than with large-scale restoration. For example under Alternative 4A, salinity generally would be similar or less than under No Action Alternative in the central Delta (e.g., near Jersey Point, Rock Slough, and along Sacramento River downstream of Steamboat Slough). Therefore, it is not anticipated that groundwater quality in these areas would substantially change due to operations of the conveyance facilities. However, salinity would increase under Alternative 4A as compared to the No Action Alternative in July through September along the Sacramento River near Collinsville and Emmaton; and generally decrease or be similar in remaining months, as presented in Appendix 5A, Section C, of the EIR/EIS. Please see Chapter 8 and associated appendices in the EIR/EIS and Master Response 14. Mitigation measures have been identified in the EIR/EIS to reduce the impacts of the Project 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.
369	4	The earthquake issue seems overblown. To us it is a scare tactic for the public. We think the concern for the health of the Delta levees can be handled in a much less costly way and	Please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is now Alternative

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		directly address the issue of any possible damage by earthquake. Many landowners of Delta property do a good job of maintaining their levees. It would take a few million dollars to upgrade any levees that need it, a much cheaper fix than the BDCP project.	4A and no longer includes an HCP Please see Chapter 2, FEIR/EIS, for the BDCP/CWF purpose and need, and Appendix 6A, Sections 6A.2 and 6A.3, for discussion on existing levee improvement programs and funding mechanisms, which would not be affected by the BDCP/CWF. Levees are an important public safety resource and the proposed project would not change levee policy or replace ongoing programs and grant projects aimed at facilitating and supporting levee improvements in or outside the Delta. It recognized that levee maintenance and safety in the Delta is an important issue for the residents of the Delta and for statewide interests.
369	5	The fish issue. Evidently, state of the art fish screens have been planned for the tunnels. Why not apply that technology to the present system?	15 alternatives and 3 new subalternatives were analyzed in the EIR/S and the RDEIR/RSEIS respectively. Four major alignments have been included in the EIR/S: Through-Delta, East of the Sacramento River, West of the Sacramento River, and a Tunnel under the Delta. Many additional proposals by public and private individuals and organizations have also been evaluated and described in Chapter 3 of the BDCP EIR/S and Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1. Regarding development of alternatives for the EIR/EIS, a description of the process the Lead Agencies followed to develop and screen alternatives is provided in Master Response 4. DWR and Reclamation are required to improve fish collection efficiency at the existing south Delta salvage facilities, as part of facility improvements required by the National Marine Fisheries Service 2009 biological opinion on the SWP/CVP. For example, in 2014 Reclamation replaced the secondary louver system with a traveling screen system. These screens provide protection by guiding fish into the holding tanks while catching debris on pegs and transporting debris to a collection system at the work surface. The technology required at the proposed north Delta intakes and the existing south Delta export facilities differ fundamentally. The north Delta intakes would be located on the side of the river channel and so would be designed to comply with CDFW, NMFS, and USFWS fish screening criteria (BDCP Appendix 5B Section 3.B.3.3). The south Delta export facilities are located on dead-end channels and requires active collection and salvage of fishes. Screening the intakes at Clifton Court Forebay was analyzed during the water conveyance alternative development process and is described in the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS, Appendix 3A. This alternative was eliminated from further evaluation because initial results of recent studies, including information included in the recent NMFS biological opinions, supported a phased approach that would emphasize

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			improvements to operations of fish handling facilities and reduced predator potential within Clifton Court Forebay prior to further analysis of installation of fish screens. Nevertheless, DWR and Reclamation will continue investigating strategies to increase fish salvage efficiency, reduce pre-screen losses, and improve screening efficiencies, consistent with the 2009 biological opinion of the SWP/CVP.
369	6	This project is projected to cost 15 billion dollars. The cost will easily double or triple before completed. How much will farmers on the Westside be expected to pay per acre foot for their water? After all, the water districts will have to recover their costs.	The construction of the water delivery facilities is estimated to cost $14.9 billion, an amount that would be paid for by the state and federal water contractors who rely on Delta exports. The range of costs for water varies widely among contractors south of the Delta. Costs depend on the source of water, transport facilities, energy requirements, among other factors. For the agricultural customers of the CVP, prices range from $100 per acre-foot to more than $400 per acre-foot. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, which buys water from the SWP, estimates that the cost of the proposed project would translate into about $5.00 extra per household, per month in its service area. The final cost of water from the new conveyance facilities would be determined by numerous factors. A number of these significant factors, such as the project yield and allocation of costs, have yet to be determined. Please see Master Response 5 for more information regarding costs and funding of the proposed project.
369	7	San Diego is going to build a desalination plant. If Los Angeles wants more water, let them build one too.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
369	8	Keep the present system with upgrades, build more storage, upgrade the Delta levees. Keep the water flowing through the Delta for the health of the Delta, the benefit of the fish, and the support of our very valuable farming and recreation industries.	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. Additionally, providing regulatory oversight to agribusinesses is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. While flood management is not a project purpose, it recognized that levee maintenance and safety in the Delta is an important issue for the residents of the Delta and for statewide interests. Please see Appendix 6A (BDCP/California WaterFix Coordination with Flood Management Requirements) for additional information

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			on this issue within the scope of the proposed project. Additional water storage was eliminated from consideration in the EIR/ EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS through the alternatives development and screening process (discussed below and in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives). As such, the proposed project does not propose storage as a project component. Although the proposed project would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, Alternative 4A is a stand-alone project which demonstrates independent utility just as future storage projects would demonstrate. Please see Master Response 37 (Water Storage) for additional information regarding on and off stream water storage. 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 refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives), Master Response 31 (Delta Reform Act), and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) for additional information.
369	9	The BDCP/California Water Fix is not a "fix". It is a way to claim an "environmental solution" to our water problems and get around having to bring the issue to voters. Unfortunately, the "fix" is in.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
370	1	In recent years, SWP deliveries have been repeatedly interrupted and reduced due to operational conflicts with threatened and endangered Delta species. These risks are unacceptable, and conditions are expected to worsen with climate change unless steps are taken now to mitigate these concerns. Alternative No. 4A of the Draft BDCP DEIR/EIS is the most promising plan developed to address these issues.	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. Please also see Master Response 19 regarding climate change.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
370	2	The SWP risks complete failure given the vulnerability of the Delta levee system to catastrophic earthquake and flood events. Such an event could threaten water supplies for southern California, the Bay Area, the Central Coast and the Central Valley for several years. These risks are unacceptable, and conditions are expected to worsen with climate change unless steps are taken now to mitigate these concerns. Alternative No. 4A of the Draft BDCP DEIR/EIS is the most promising plan developed to address these issues.	The issues raised by the commenters address the merits of the project and do not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS documentation.
370	3	We support Alternative No. 4A's proposed twin-tunnel conveyance system that would isolate and protect drinking water supplies in the event of catastrophic levee failure and help restore natural Delta flow patterns to benefit native species, as well as fully mitigating construction impacts of the project. This is of great importance to CLWA given the ever-increasing risk of seismic failure in the Delta.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
370	4	The modifications incorporated into Alternative 4A reflect changes in response to many concerns identified in comments on the original DEIR/DEIS. The process for compliance with Federal Endangered Species Act under Section 7 and the California Endangered Species Act under 2081b provides for the most timely schedule for completing these projects.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
370	5	California's experience of a declining Delta ecosystem, reduced water supply reliability and increased vulnerability to natural disasters serve to highlight consequences of decades of failing to invest in vital water supply infrastructure. We urge the state and federal governments to quickly move forward with Alternative No. 4A.	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.
371	1	My question is: How is this, the water conversions, going to affect my father-in-law's ranch on Ryer Island? Is it going to affect his ability to irrigate his pears? Because he's worked for 40 years to get what he has, and I don't want anything to jeopardize what he's worked so hard for.	The preferred alternative, Alternative 4A, water conveyance alignment does not intersect Ryer Island. The water supply analysis addresses changes to water supply to SWP and CVP water users in the Delta region, upstream of the Delta Region, and Export Service Areas due to implementation of the Proposed Project conveyance facilities (CM1) and other conservation measures (HCP/NCCP alternatives), specifically tidal marsh habitat restoration (CM4). Consistent with previous modeling analyses conducted by DWR and Reclamation, including the 2008 Biological Assessment on the Continued Long-Term Operations of the Central Valley Project and State Water Project, the modeling analyses presented in this section assumed that the SWP and CVP were solely responsible for providing any needed water for implementation of the Proposed Project. The alternatives would not modify water deliveries to non-SWP and non-CVP water rights holders, including in-Delta water rights holders. Therefore, the water supply analysis addresses impacts to DWR, Reclamation, and SWP water users and CVP water service contractors, as opposed to other water

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			rights holders, as the Proposed Project does not include any regulatory actions that would affect water availability to any such water rights holders. Please see Master Response 26 regarding Delta exports, area of origin protections and existing water rights.
372	1	I think this tunnel is a terrible idea, and that's why we came to the meeting. It diverts all the water from the Delta down to southern California through the California Aqueduct. And it looks like it just drains the Delta and lets the sea water come in through the connection down to the west a little bit.	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.
372	2	I think it's a Jerry Brown boondock -- and I don't know how to spell "boondock" -- and I think it's just like his high-speed rail, same kind of thing. It's something we don't need. What we should do is put some money into water storage. You've probably heard all this before, haven't you? Same song, different dance. So that's how I feel about it. Of course, I live here, which affects me more.	Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Please see Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage.
373	1	I live on Sherman Island, and I'm definitely opposed to the tunnels. The salt water is already intruding farther up the Sacramento River, eventually in the years of drought, and it's pulling the water out of the Sacramento River up by Courtland and Hood. That water that would normally be flowing through the Delta is going to be gone. And I can't understand how you people, you DWR people, can maintain that the water would still be of good quality, especially in the lower Delta.	The potential for water conveyance operations to affect salinity conditions in the Delta (including Suisun Marsh) under existing conditions and future no action conditions, and with implementation of each project alternative (including conservation measures), is assessed in detail in Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the EIR/EIS for the salinity-related parameters bromide (Impact WQ-5), chloride (Impact WQ-7), and electrical conductivity (Impact WQ-11). Where significant impacts to water quality would occur due to the alternative, mitigation to lessen those impacts is provided.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
373	2	The State Government, in recent projects, has a history of not running the projects on budget or on time. And a project of this scope, I could see it--the budget doubling and the timeline being a lot longer. I worked for 30 years in the construction industry and worked on a couple of different tunnels, and there's no more dangerous method and more expensive method of constructing a water conveyance.	DWR acknowledges your opposition to the project. Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on the costs of project implementation.
373	3	To me, you are catering and pandering to Southern California, and I feel that Southern California should figure out where to get their own water. They're doing better with conservation, and we could desalinate, like, San Diego. I don't know why the State doesn't make all new subdivisions and have gray water and black water sewer treatment facilities.	The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. Although 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 proposed project. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including storm water drainage. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. Please also see Master Response 7 regarding desalination.
373	4	I think it's a fanciful idea to build the tunnels, and I sure hope it can be put to a vote because I'm pretty sure most people would be against it.	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.
374	1	I am against the tunnels because I feel that there's no way, considering today's water resources, that they could ever be of any use, as well as the fact that paying for them would be beyond anybody's capability to pay for.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Refer to Master Response 45 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 38 (Cost).
374	2	Governor Brown has said that the people in the San Diego area --wherever the water's going-- are going to have to pay for it, and they don't even know how much that water will cost to run.	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.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.
374	3	I'm sure that it will bring more salt water into our area. Just like Jay Uhalt before me said, I've seen the salt water come up to the north end of Sherman Island over the last ten years because of it being compound.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
375	1	I want to know: What are we doing for people who have lived somewhere for 150 years, have been farming pears there for 150 years, and now they're going to remove their home and put in the two 40-foot tunnels, initial sucking stations?	The California WaterFix would be implemented to meet all applicable laws related to property rights and property acquisition and is complying with all Federal and State environmental regulations, including CEQA, NEPA, Clean Water Act, and ESA and CESA, among other required permit requirements. This comment expresses concern about loss of property associated with the California WaterFix conveyance facilities. DWR does not take the issue of Delta property acquisition lightly. The EIR/EIS discloses that approximately 76 structures could be affected by facility construction. Property owners affected by needed land acquisition would receive just compensation for the property acquired.
375	2	Is there a minimum flow that would stop the water from being sent down south?	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 project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities, including operations to protect water quality, can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html). As occurred in the recent drought, there are periods of time there would be periods when water cannot be exported for SWP and CVP water service contractors under these objectives.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Similarly, the North Delta intakes would be operated in accordance with future regulatory requirements adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife, including the North Delta Bypass Flows that would restrict conveyance through the North Delta intakes (see Chapter 3 of the EIR/S).
375	3	Why are we sending water away from a fertile area into an area that is basically not meant to be farmed? I mean, it's a desert full of selenium. So now we're bringing that water in developing it into the water table, and essentially poisoning the California water table.	For information about effects of the project to selenium, please refer to Master Response 14.
375	4	Every time I ask questions in there, I get the same answer, "I have a communications firm and you're getting beyond what I really know about that", and they frankly told me that. And I was just a little bit disgusted in the fact that my limited knowledge and my simple questions couldn't be answered because they were over the head of people being paid. And then I asked them, 'Who paid you?' and they told me that they're being paid by the -- I think it's ICF and by an environmental firm that's hired by the people who are ultimately going to get the water. So my view on the California Water Fix is: The fix is in. And I really hope we can turn it around and keep the water here, where the farms are fertile.	Numerous DWR and Reclamation staff were available to answer questions at the public open house sessions in 2015. There were more than a dozen staff with technical expertise and knowledge about the proposed project and environmental document. The commenter does not raise any issues related to the related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S.
376	1	My concern is with the fish studies, what it's going to do to the salmon, steelhead, and sturgeon fishing. The studies for the program are inaccurate, they were rushed, they haven't been done by an outside agency. They've only been done by government people that are paying their paychecks. So how do they think their studies are going to come up?	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. For information about effects of the preferred alternative, Alternative 4A, on salmonids and sturgeon, please see Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Resources, which indicates that effects would not be adverse. Therefore, there would be no adverse effects to the coastal fishing industry due to the alternative.
376	2	The water quality isn't going to help the fish. The salt water is going to moving farther up this way, which isn't going to help the farmers.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
376	3	They talk about that they're only going to take [sic]--every station that I went to had the same thing, 'Well, we're only going to take as much water as we're taking now.' What are they building these big tunnels for if they want the same amount of water? Eventually	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		they're going to take more water. They want to get their foot in the door.	alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal and State regulating agencies, ESA compliance, and project design. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. 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. The total amount of water exported by month in each water year type for each action alternative is presented in Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Model Results, of the EIR/EIS. As shown in Appendix 5A, Section C, the north Delta intake tunnels would not be fully utilized except for a few months in wet years. However, it is important to have 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 north Delta intakes would have minimal flows that would be required for maintenance of the pumps during critical dry years.
376	4	I'm tired, as an American citizen, of being lied to by the Government. They've been trying to pass this through the voting process, and they have not been able to pass it for more than 30 years. They've tried again and again and again. They built that--part of that canal right down here by Courtland is part of it that [sic]--that's how long they've been pushing for it.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
376	5	And then somebody got the bright idea--and they're a genius; right? I have to give them credit--to disguise that as this as a save the fish, save the wildlife, save the birds, sanctuary thing, when in reality what it really is is we're taking water down the Southern California, the same water that you all voted no for 30 years against. We set up a smoke screen, re-described the project and everything to make it sound--and the only fish that it's really	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 with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to establish a

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		going to help are the smelt fish, which nobody cares about. Okay? They're--they're a very small--how many people do you know that go smelt fishing or have anything to do with smelt? None. Zero. Right?	more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility.
376	6	It's just like when the Government wants to condemn a building. All they do is bring an engineer down and tell them, "Hey, we're telling you to tell us that that building isn't safe," and before you know it, that building's going down to the ground. And the same building would have stood there for 100 years if--if it's in their way--and big money people are pushing for this down South. You can tell that by who's funding the project; right? The--and they're--it's been disguised to help fish, to help people.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
376	7	What are you going to do when the salmon numbers and steelhead and sturgeon numbers drop? They're already in the toilet. Anybody that works for the Department of Fish and Game will tell you that the numbers of the fish are way down; right? And so now when you guys start doing this and all the sudden, hey, they drop down, way down even much farther, what are you guys going to do? You know what I mean? You're going to say, "We're sorry." Right? It's not going to help our fish. It's not going to help the guys going out there fishing. God's been taking care of the rivers and fish for many years. It's just like they destroyed the natural gravel beds and all the stuff for the salmon to lay their eggs and stuff, and they put these dams in and stuff, and they're--and so then they build fisheries, and they take these fish, and they take the fish and cart them off in these great big trailers and dump them into the river, and they're in shock and most of them just get eaten by other fish. When you put the Government in charge of fish, the fish always come out high and dry.	The proposed project would enable DWR to construct and operate new conveyance facilities that improve conditions for endangered and threatened aquatic species in the Delta while at the same time improving water supply reliability, consistent with California law (see, e.g., Cal.Wat. Code, § 85001[c]). Implementing the conveyance facilities would help resolve many of the concerns with the current south Delta conveyance system, and would help reduce threats to endangered and threatened species in the Delta, including entrainment eat the south Delta export facilities. For instance, implementing a dual conveyance system would align water operations, and their location, to better reflect natural seasonal flow patterns by creating new water diversions in the north Delta equipped with State-of-the-art fish screens, thus reducing reliance on south Delta exports during times of the year when listed aquatic species are present and most vulnerable. For information about effects of the preferred alternative, Alternative 4A, on salmonids and the commercial salmon industry, please see Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Resources, which indicates that effects would not be adverse.
377	1	As a physician, I'm quite sensitive to the risk of vector-borne disease. I've had a patient who lived locally that died of West Nile Virus. I'm well aware of another patient--and I'm married to a physician--and this lady lives on the river. She had a paralytic, polio-type form of West Nile and has to travel with long leg braces, crutches or walker. She can't walk independently. Again, because spraying for mosquitos is done in urban areas, it's not done along the river, but the proposed style of water exposure makes us very vulnerable to West	The lead agencies acknowledge your concern. Certain features of the proposed project (e.g., cofferdams at the intake sites, sedimentation basins, solids lagoons, and the intermediate forebay inundation area) have the potential to provide mosquito breeding habitat. The depth, design, and operation of the sedimentation basins and solids lagoons would prevent the development of suitable mosquito habitat primarily due to their depth (23 feet and 15 feet, respectively), and because the water contained in these structures would be constantly circulated and the flow rates would be high enough to prevent water from stagnating.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Nile. I'm particularly living in terror about the West Nile risks because I have children and grandchildren present in my home every weekend, and our property on Scribner Road is within about 30 feet walking distance of the first intake. I think the mosquito problem will make it uninhabitable, as well as the loss of the aesthetic comfort of having to leave a farm home, when we're used to living in rural America, and suddenly be living in industrialized America. Our home was an original Scribner home. We have a lot of Scribner neighbors. We've been privileged to watch farming operations at our home.	Additionally, project proponents will consult with the appropriate mosquito vector control district(s) prior to construction of the intakes and before the sedimentation basins, solids lagoons and the intermediate forebay inundation area become operational to inform mosquito management and control practices in order to limit public health risks from mosquito-borne diseases. Further, once the sedimentation basins, solids lagoons and intermediate forebay inundation area become operational, Project proponents will again consult with the mosquito vector control districts to determine if mosquitoes are present in these conveyance components. If mosquitos are present, mosquito control techniques will be implemented. To minimize the potential for impacts related to increasing suitable vector habitat within the study area, DWR would consult and coordinate with San Joaquin County and Sacramento-Yolo County MVCDs and prepare and implement Mosquito Management Plans. Best Management Practices to be implemented as part of the MMPs would help control mosquitoes during construction and operation of the sedimentation basins, solids lagoons, the expanded Clifton Court Forebay, the intermediate forebay, and the intermediate forebay inundation area. These BMPs would be consistent with practices presented in the California Department of Public Health's Best Management Practices for Mosquito Control in California (California Department of Public Health 2012). See Appendix 3B, Section 3B.2.15, Prepare and Implement Mosquito Management Plans, for more information.
377	2	I'm quite concerned about the displacement of the crane population. When I come home at night, the cranes, all winter long, fly overhead. I can go out and photograph them. I have a huge collection of photos I can submit. These cranes don't have a place to come to because they can't feed on the ground that you're going to use for muck piles and your concrete batch production.	Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect sandhill cranes. The chapter describes the impacts, both negative and positive, and discusses measures that would be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts and to compensate for significant impacts.
377	3	There's Indian burial grounds in the area. And I think it's disturbing the ancestral bones of our Native Americans will be disturbed by the location of the first intake.	The commenter's opinion related to the DEIR/S is acknowledged. 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 Responses 20 and 21.
377	4	The Water Fix is going to wipe out all the businesses between Freeport and Walnut Grove	Effects associated with construction activities could also result in changes to community cohesion if they were to restrict mobility, reduce opportunities for maintaining face-to-face relationships, or disrupt the

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		because it's going to use the River Road, which they now do.	functions of community organizations or community gathering places (such as schools, libraries, places of worship, and recreational facilities). Under Alternative 4A, several gathering places that lie in the vicinity of construction areas could be indirectly affected by noise and traffic associated with construction activities, including Delta High School, the Clarksburg Library, Clarksburg Community Church, Resurrection Life Community Church, Citizen Land Alliance, Discovery Bay Chamber of Commerce, Courtland Fire Department, and several marinas or other recreational facilities (see Chapter 15, Recreation, Table 15-15). Implementation of mitigation measures and environmental commitments related to noise, visual effects, transportation, agriculture, and recreation, would reduce adverse effects (see Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs). 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.
377	5	The beauty now is people can come here on foot, by bicycle. You don't need a boat to go fishing. You can fish from the banks. We have greater than two million people in the metropolitan area, and these people need a place for recreation. You can get here from downtown in 10 or 20 minutes, and you don't have to make the four-hour drive to beautiful Yosemite. This is our equivalent of Yosemite Valley, and we need to preserve the sacred beauty of its fishing, cycling, visiting wineries, visiting the restaurants. It's all an important destination for people living in urban America.	Please refer to Impacts 4, 5, and 9 regarding impacts to fishing. Please refer to Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, for a discussion of impacts to tourism. Additionally, Mitigation Measure REC-2 would ensure access to nearby fishing by enhancing formal fishing sites near the proposed water conveyance facilities, and providing adequate signage directing anglers to the formal sites.
377	6	We also have the farm deform issue. I live next door to a truck driver, where farm produce is raised by Mr. Kelly. Your batch plant would take out his farming operation.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
378	1	One of the questions that I would like to see answered is why the alternative of using the Deep Water Channel on the east side or the west side of the Delta is not being looked at. It is a much more efficient, cost-effective approach and handles it more with the realities of [what is] available to be transferred.	Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the BDCP/California WaterFix or FEIR/EIS.
378	2	Another point I would like to have answered is: Will the tunnels be dewatered when they are not flowing? And if they are being dewatered, what does that do to the integrity of the tunnel? And if they aren't being dewatered, what does that do to the quality of the water	The tunnels would not be dewatered and a minimum continuous diversion would occur to maintain the quality of water conveyed through the tunnels.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		that will go stagnant in the tunnel while it's not being used? My understanding [is] it will pollute a large percentage of what is in the aqueducts going south as the putrid water comes out of the tunnels after. I also do not understand how they can have the amount of tunnels that they're going to propose based off of the water flows that have been forecast with the change in climate.	
378	3	If [it] takes ten years to build these tunnels, the associated disruption in the entire north Delta community may not kill the agricultural operations, but will clearly destroy the social fabric of the small communities and kill the restaurants and the recreational community -- because who wants to go on vacation in a construction zone?	Chapter 16 of the EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A (Socioeconomics) identifies the unique features of the Delta and describes the potential effects on Delta communities. Please see chapter 15 for a discussion on impacts to recreation. Impacts to agriculture are identified and discussed in Chapter 14; project proponents have proposed measures that would support and protect agricultural production in the Delta by securing agricultural easements and/or by seeking opportunities to protect and enhance agriculture with a focus on maintaining economic activity on agricultural lands. Please see Master Response 18 for more information on agricultural mitigation.
378	4	What will be the mitigation issues ten years from now when -- after the point of construction, when you get soil -- surface subsidence, which breaks pipes, alters aquifers and disrupts the health and safety of the community because it will disrupt the reclamation districts?	GEO-3 describes the expected width of the settlement "trough," the depth of settlement, and the change in ground slope that is anticipated at certain developed areas and infrastructure (including the EBMUD aqueducts and other critical infrastructure) as a result of the tunneling operation. The estimated changes refer to long-term maximums, and therefore reflect what may occur ten or more years after the tunneling has been completed in a given area.
379	1	I've seen when the canal, the Peripheral Canal, was first put in and how it affected Sherman Island and destroyed its agriculture from being the richest in farm to literally seeing the white of the salt on that whole entire island and destroyed the agriculture in most -- in parts of the Delta.	Salinity has increased in the western Delta due to many factors, including early climate change and sea level rise. The EIR/EIS modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present. For more information regarding the difference between the peripheral canals to the CA WaterFix please see Master Response 36. For more information regarding impacts to agriculture and its associated mitigation measures please see Chapter 14 of the FEIR/EIS.
379	2	How can these people sleep at night? How can they take water from families and people that need it to survive to give it to people who are going to take more water that is not theirs to have. They're taking it into central California which is a desert land. It's sand. Even if they take our water to central California, it's still desert. You can't make it fertile by adding water. It's still a desert and will always be a desert because God made it a desert. Deferring water to Central California for the purposes of almond growers and the mandarin oranges is	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		not a priority or it should not be a priority. The priority should be in taking water and giving water to the people that need it and the families that need the water, and that's my whole concern.	Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.
379	3	The weakening of levees, I believe, is inevitable. As much as some of your engineers assure me that it's not, I still have that concern. My levee taxes have gone up 200 to 300 percent in the last ten years. I don't know when this is going to stop. I would like some answers.	Please see Appendix 6A, Section 6A.6.2.1.3, FEIR/EIS, for a discussion on DWR consistency with the State Plan of Flood Control (SPFC), and Section 6A.6.1.2 for information on project consistency with USACE, CVFPB, and DWR flood standards and regulations. Overall, construction and operations of the proposed project will not increase flood risk to people or structures in the Delta because the project will be designed and operated to ensure flood neutrality in the Delta and surrounding communities.
380	1	I am very concerned about the cultural loss of salmonid culture and collapse of the Delta habitat as it's reflected in the collapse of the salmonid fisheries and the millennial traditions of what are the staple protein of this land for many thousands of years. The 35% pumping of fresh water to the canals represents a reduced flow to the wetlands of the Delta that were and are critical to the habitat restoration potential.	Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Species, of the FEIR/FEIS describes the projected effects of the new preferred alternative, Alternative 4A to fish species. The analysis finds that there would be no adverse effects to salmonids.
380	2	The technology improvements can be made on the existing pumps, and the political economic climate that has historically overallocated our freshwater resources are only further enabled to overallocate future resources, and the new tunnels will and can serve to enable this overallocation.	Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
380	3	Desalination technology is a better use of public resources as well as the complete habitat restoration of the Delta for juvenile salmonids.	Please see Master Response 7 for a discussion of desalination. Actions that are not in the California WaterFix such as largescale habitat restoration are instead being implemented separately under the California EcoRestore program and the California Water Action Plan.
381	1	[I am] concerned about the encroachment of the salt water coming up. [I am] concerned about the water level going down and also the quality. If it [does not] get flushed down through here, [it is] not going to get flushed out. So you start sucking all of it from above and going around the Delta [is] a no brainer.	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.
381	2	[The voters] shot the canal down in '82, and we fought it all along, and our dear Governor is here again trying to shove it through. So [it is] all about pandering for votes. [It is] all about shipping our water to the users down south.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
381	3	Look at Pyramid Lake; [it is] full. You look at Folsom Lake, [it is] almost down to where it [cannot] suck any more water out. [I am] just totally, totally against it all the way around. And I will do anything I can to fight it.	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.
382	1	I am a farmer in the Delta. I have been a farmer in the Delta for well over forty years. My father farmed in the Delta long before this. I have seen the Delta damaged over the years, more and more. My father used to farm on Sherman Island. Sherman Island is now unfarmable because of the salt water intrusion that has come up the Bay. Back in the thirties and forties, it was a very, very productive island. The same thing is going to happen right now with the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
382	2	There is absolutely no way that you can save the Delta by stealing the water and routing the water around the Delta. I do not care how many studies they show. I do noit care how they try and frame it. This is a pig. They are putting lipstick on a pig, but it is still a pig.	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
382	3	They are routing water around the Sacramento Delta. There is a theft of water. There is no excess water. We have been in a four year drought situation. We have had droughts previously. As I have farmed in the Delta, I have seen droughts. There is no excess water. They have not provided the storage necessary for there ever to be excess water, and until they do so, there is none. Toroute water around the Delta is a very, very poor idea. It is going to destroy the natural habitats of the Delta. It is going to destroy the wildlife in the Delta. It is going to destroy the economic farming of the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities, including operations to protect water quality, can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html). The proposed project was developed to improve Delta habitat and SWP/CVP water supply reliability. Through the development of specific operational criteria, some of the actions in the 2008 U.S. Fish and Wildlife and 2009 National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinion reasonable and prudent alternatives would be superseded with the proposed project operational criteria, as described in Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives, in the EIR/S.
382	4	As the water is removed and circled around the Delta, there will be salt water intrusion. There is no way that they can prevent it. As the salt water instrudes, there will be damage to the Delta, to the wildlife, and to the flora and fauna in the Delta. I am very much opposed.	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.
382	5	We are sacrificing one area of the state to bring water to another area of the state. If there was excess water, I would not have a complaint, but there is nbo exces water. They	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		have shown there is no excess water. This drought has put a underline under the fact that there is no excess water. The farmers in the Delta are very much concerned, as am I being one of those farmers, that this is nothing more than a theft of the water to supply another region of the state. This is something that is just totally unacceptable to the farmers and the people that are the natives, that live and work in the Delta. The wildlife, the fish and fauna will be damaged.	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.
383	1	I've been working with small farmers in the Sacramento area about certified farmers' markets. And we're very dependent on the small farmers in this Delta for our asparagus and pears and other extraordinary food. The economy of that size farmer in this region is really significant, and a different kind of, you know, [agriculture] that's the more corporate, you know, southern California, so I'm very concerned about the preservation of that.	The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. In its efforts to achieve the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration, the California WaterFix seeks to protect dozens of species of fish and wildlife in the Delta while also securing reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California. Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed California WaterFix.
383	2	I'm very concerned that in this climate change period of time that we're going through, that I think is seriously real, that we would make such permanent investment in something where we haven't tried other alternatives. We need to test out other ways to reclaim water, do cisterns, and spend billions of dollars exploring more ways to use the water that is coming to us when it's so unpredictable about what will happen currently and in the future.	The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of one particular water supply augmentation approach (reclamation) and does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the range of alternatives selected. The alternatives included in the Draft EIR/EIS represent a legally adequate reasonable range of alternatives and the scope of the analysis of alternatives fully complies with both CEQA and NEPA. The Lead Agencies carefully considered all potential alternatives that were proposed during the scoping process and during time of preparation of the Draft EIR/EIS. In response to public input, several new alternatives have been studied in the Recirculated DEIR/EIS and a new preferred Alternative (4A) identified.
383	3	Living here I became originally a birder, and didn't know about the sandhill cranes, but grew up with the eagles and the preservation of that habitat. I know work has been done on this plan, but since I've been viewing the birds for the last eight years, there's been a significant loss of habitat already by orchards coming in, so we need not to disturb that habitat any longer, even though it's been disturbed already without us building a tunnel.	Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect habitat for birds and other wildlife species. The chapter describes the impacts, both negative and positive, and discusses measures that would be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts and to compensate for significant impacts.
383	4	I seriously think more creativity needs to be given with the current knowledge we have about climate change and options that haven't been explored; we need to explore them	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		before we make this significant harmful thing called the tunnel. So I also feel like there's a design period, I mean, I think this project has been going on for eight or nine years, and it's sort of like talking a little bit about what's happened with court reporting tools based on technology and creativity, and we can't hold onto something that was started in a design as long ago as that was.	600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. 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 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives. Also, please see Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management.
383	5	The place where agriculture is in a corporate sense in southern California, was never intended to be an agricultural place; it was a desert. And it was only possible because of the water we've taken from other parts the country. And environmentally we just can't continue to do that.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
383	6	I think there are a lot of creative people right now, scientists and advocates who are really looking at other ways for us to capture water, use other tools that -- I mean, there's just a lot of creativity going on. I read today that forty percent of Californians have reduced their water by forty percent in California already, our use. There's a lot of creativity and we have to explore it before we do this. I hope we never do this.	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 1C of the Final EIR/EIS, Demand Management Measures, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. Refer to Master Response 6 for more information on demand management. Although components such as desalination plants and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the State, they are beyond the scope of the project. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives.
384	1	I'm representing Solagra Company. We have put in an alternative intake and conveyance option in the west Delta. The Solagra proposal basically addresses only the state water project's entitlements, water rights. We will basically pump those, filter those, de-sal a million acre feet of water from the Suisun Bay so that's new water to the system. And we would pump it through a 23 foot tunnel to Bethany reservoir to place into the state water project's existing conveyance. The	Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives (such as desalination) that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that they required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project. However, nothing in the proposed project would prevent other entities from pursuing innovative approaches to desalination or other water supply solutions. As described in Appendix 3A, Section 3A.7, Results of Initial Screening of Conveyance Alternatives, EIR/EIS (2013), desalination was included as part of Alternative B7. Issues related to desalination include land use impacts, costs, and substantial energy use requirements. Advances in technology have improved feasibility of desalination and as a statewide water use planning component; it will be evaluated by water agencies on

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		water would be higher quality than what is now being provided. We would power this with a solar project that is in process of being worked out currently on Ryer Island. It would generate more than 700 megawatts of solar power. The--we put the comment in during the initial comment period on the BDCP, never really got any questions. Our project is very different than what was proposed by Mr. Pike. So basically we need to ensure that other west Delta intake alternatives are evaluated under NEPA and CEQA rather than just these intakes on the Sacramento River in various routes to get to the south. Our project would have the advantage of improving the water quality in the Delta by retaining the flow of the Sacramento River, and decreasing the use of banks to zero except when there is flood stage, which would increase the amount of water and freshen up the water in the Delta which would solve many of the water quality project problems. We would be providing desalinated water for one million of the 2.5 million acre feet that the State Water Project has, taking that from the Suisun Bay. So it would be much less of a demand on the water intakes in the Delta. We would basically be enabling then the Big Gulp concept for the central valley project by using Bethany.	a local/regional level. Desalination, the process of removing salt and other minerals from seawater to make it suitable for drinking or irrigation, is being implemented in several California communities. However, it has not proven viable to secure adequate water supplies to meet California's needs due to high costs and energy demands. Today, desalination creates an estimated 84,000 acre-feet of potable water a year in the state, mostly through treatment of brackish groundwater, which is less salty and cheaper to treat than sea water. In comparison, the proposed project would secure an estimated 4.7 to 5.2 million acre-feet of water to supply more than 25 million people and 3 million acres of farmland. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Local water agencies will need to invest in additional strategies and technologies, including desalination, to meet future water demand. 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 see Master Response 7 regarding desalination. Appendix 3A thoroughly explains why various proposals were not analyzed in the EIR/EIS, including the NRDC Portfolio-Based Proposal, Congressman Garamendi's Water Plan, a proposal from the Water Advisory Committee of Orange County, the so-called Pyke proposal, and other similar concepts that would require actions that are beyond the scope of the proposed project. As explained in Appendix 3A, the Lead Agencies, in developing the EIR/EIS alternatives, considered all of these options, including potential desalination, and explained why such potential alternatives were not carried forward for detailed analysis in the EIR/EIS. SolAgra's proposed West Delta Intake Plan (WDIP) is substantially similar to other proposals recommending the treatment of brackish or near-brackish water and the export of treated water from a location considerably downstream from the proposed North Delta diversion locations. The Lead Agencies have already considered and rejected such concepts for various reasons, including failure to achieve the project's purposes, as well as costs and technical challenges. Notably, moreover, any diversion location that today is just near the point where fresh water mixes with brackish water will be subject to sea level rise over the

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			coming decades. Such locations will be dealing with purely brackish water at some point in the future, substantially increasing treatment costs. By being located further upstream on the Sacramento River, the new diversions included under the proposed project would help protect critical water supplies against the threats of sea level rise and earthquakes, among numerous environmental benefits. As explained in EIR/EIS Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need, and Master Response 3, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need, the project objectives include: • To make physical improvements to the conveyance system in anticipation of rising sea levels and other reasonably foreseeable consequences of climate change. • To make physical improvements to the conveyance system that will minimize the potential for public health and safety impacts resulting from a major earthquake that causes breaching of Delta levees and the inundation of brackish water into the areas in which the SWP and CVP pumping plants operate in the southern Delta. Locating new intakes in the western Delta at the mixing zone of high-salinity water and freshwater outflows, as proposed by the commenter, would not achieve these objectives. The Final EIR analyzes 18 project alternatives representing a reasonable range of alternatives for CEQA and NEPA purposes. For more information regarding alternatives to the proposed project please see Master Response 4 (Alternatives Development). Please note that 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 (BDCP) remains a potentially viable alternative and was carried forward in this RDEIR/SDEIS and Final EIR/EIS 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 and presented for public and agency review and comment in the RDEIR/SDEIS. If the Lead Agencies ultimately choose the alternative implementation strategy and select an alternative analyzed in the RDEIR/SDEIS and Final EIR/EIS after completing the CEQA and NEPA processes, elements of the conservation plan contained in

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			the alternatives in the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS may be utilized by other programs for implementation of the long term conservation efforts. For further responses to comments on the BDCP, please see Master Response 5 (BDCP). The Lead Agencies appreciate the commenter's desire to assist the State in its water management challenges. The commenter has devised a commendable concept for desalinating brackish water through solar power. Going forward, projects of this kind may be important parts of the overall water supply solution for California. The use of solar power would make them consistent with the State's climate policies. Depending on the particular circumstances facing a particular water agency, such a project could well be feasible. But, in the context of fixing the problems facing the State Water Project as one part of the State's overall water infrastructure, the concept of a major desalination project significantly downstream from the proposed locations of the three diversion structures associated with the proposed California Water Fix has previously been carefully considered, although none of these proposals was identical to what the commenter is suggesting. Such a concept was not carried forward for full analysis. Please refer to Master Response 4 and Appendix 3A of the EIR/EIS for additional details on the selection of alternatives. The alternatives included in the 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 specific proposals that were considered by the Lead Agencies are discussed in Appendix 3A of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 3A explains why various proposals were not analyzed in the EIR/EIS, including concepts that include diversion facilities near Rio Vista, including a potential alternative with an intake at Sherman Island and intakes near City of Antioch. The ability to divert water in the western Delta (e.g., near Rio Vista, Antioch, Decker Island, or Sherman Island) could be limited due to the presence of delta smelt in the winter and spring months by requirements of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife. In July through November, salinity could be too high for use by the SWP and CVP facilities, especially as sea level rise progresses. It should be noted that Delta exports are diverted for conveyance through both SWP Banks Pumping Plant and CVP Jones Pumping Plant to provide over 6.6 million acre-feet/year in wet years. Please also see Master Response 3 for information on the purpose and need for the proposed project. 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 diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			flexibility. 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. It is intended to improve both in-Delta and export water quality.
385	1	How will the pipelines from the intakes traveling directly below Hood affect the wells, the water wells in Hood, the water availability? Is there mitigation?	The tunnel would be installed approximately 100 to 150 feet below the ground surface. No dewatering or other construction activities would occur along the tunnel alignment except at the tunnel shaft sites. In the Final EIR/EIS the description of the proposed project, Alternative 4A, was modified to include slurry wall installation to protect local groundwater conditions under construction including at tunnel shaft locations. 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.
385	2	Hood Franklin Road, will there be access to the staging area on the south side of Hood directly from the bridge on the east side of Hood rather than driving through the community of Hood? Also, an access road to the intakes north of Hood directly from the ridge north rather than driving through the community of hood.	Prior to construction, the lead agencies will ensure development of site-specific construction traffic management plans (TMPs) that address the specific steps to be taken before, during, and after construction to minimize traffic impacts, including the mitigation measures and environmental commitments identified in this EIR/EIS. Mitigation Measure TRANS-1c also seeks to work with affected jurisdictions to enhance capacity of congested roadway segments where construction traffic will substantially affect transportation facilities.
385	3	The power lines traveling through and around Hood, will they affect our power availability?	Mitigation Measures UT-6a, UT-6b, and UT-6c are available to reduce the severity of and impacts to existing regional or local utilities. If coordination with all appropriate utility providers and local agencies to integrate with other construction projects and minimize disturbance to communities were successful under Mitigation

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Measure UT-6b, the effect would not be adverse and power availability will not be affected. Please see Chapter 20, Public Services and Utilities for more detail on these Mitigation Measures.
386	1	Concerns are the costs of this project. This environment has some very unique agricultural land, both in terms of soils and climate. For instance, a lot of the soils that line the inside of the levees are alluvial soils formed from Placer mining debris. And there are no other soils like that anywhere else, in this state at least. Another concern is the soils that will be buried with all the debris from the construction of the tunnels.	The commenter is perhaps correct that the Delta is the only area in the state in which Placer mining debris (i.e., sediment) has accumulated on the waterside of the levees. However, these sediments, much of which are under water or otherwise inaccessible from an agricultural use standpoint, are not protected by any regulation known to the Lead Agencies.
386	2	A concern is of course, the impaired aesthetics from that construction debris.	As identified in Chapter 17 (Aesthetics and Visual Resources) on page 17-2 of the RDEIR/RDEIS, Mitigation Measure AES-1c, Develop and Implement a Tunnel Work and Reusable Tunnel Material Area Management Plan, would aid in remediating visual impacts associated with spoils placement. This mitigation measure will complement and is related to activities described under Mitigation Measure SOILS-2b, Chapter 10, Soils. Note that Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, contains measures under "Disposal and Reuse of Spoils, Reusable Tunnel Material (RTM), and Dredged Material," to remove all debris, rubbish, and other materials from the work site that are not directed to be salvaged and dispose of them in an approved disposal site after obtaining all permits required. In addition, this commitment addresses that topsoil will be saved for reapplication to disturbed areas post construction.
386	3	I'm also very concerned about the reduced flushing of the Delta due to the diversion of the water. And a special concern about water quality down where the Delta enters the Carquinez Straits. I have growers that I work with down there that are already challenged at times with excessive chloride from these waters.	The potential for water conveyance operations to affect salinity conditions in the Delta (including Suisun Marsh) under existing conditions and future no action conditions, and with implementation of each project alternative (including conservation measures), is assessed in detail in Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the EIR/EIS for the salinity-related parameters chloride (Impact WQ-7) and electrical conductivity (Impact WQ-11). Where significant impacts to water quality would occur due to the alternative, mitigation to lessen those impacts is provided.
386	4	There are the construction costs associated with this whole project. So those are the costs.	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 5 regarding costs of the proposed project.
386	5	One possible benefit is increased reliability of supply for regions further south, and reduced fish kill. And while those are laudable benefits, I don't see how they outweigh the costs.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal and State regulating agencies, ESA compliance, and project design. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. 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.
386	6	I feel that alternatives have not been considered fully, such as water storage upstream, reservoirs that would allow the release of water as needed down south.	Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed. Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage was not included.
386	7	The possibility of some engineered feature to keep fish out of the forebay. Some clever source of screens or some other devices that I'm sure somewhere there's a clever engineer that can come up with a solution for that.	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.
387	1	We built Scribner Bend Vineyards on the bend of the river. We work very, very hard seven days a week. We rebuilt this business ourselves, we didn't even have a riding lawn mower. And now this is where all of this project is starting to take place is on our property. Okay. We're very concerned. It took us a long time to build this up. My husband is now 73, I'm 72.	It is true that the most northern intake for the proposed project would be located south of Scribner Bend Vineyards. Please see Chapter 19 Traffic for information on construction traffic impacts

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Our children will be trying to go on with this. We have a winery and wedding facility where it has grown and become very popular because of word of mouth and because of the way people are treated when they come to our area. They love the beauty of the river. They love that it's so close to town but yet feels so far away. We're very concerned, a lot of this project is going on our property. We know that trucks will be coming up and down which will ruin our business completely. This will devastate us. We asked how we would be compensated, what their plan is, their long-range plan. One person told me there won't be any trucks going up and down the river, that it won't be stopped. Another person told me yes, it will be stopped.	
387	2	If I thought this was going to better our world or Southern California, I would be the first one behind it. I don't think the plan is a good plan. I think there's other options. I think the Delta has come up with other options. I think you're destroying one of the last beauties of California and we are completely devastated over this terrible decision.	The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7 regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage.
387	3	We're worried about the salt water coming up. We already can see it in Isleton if you look across the water and see what was done. We just took a trip to Southern California, came back, people are using water like there's no tomorrow; where our crops, if you look at, we have cut early to save water, we're doing everything in our power to do it. I don't even turn on the sink water without thinking twice about it. So really no one has answers for me. I feel very, very said about this. And I don't know what else to say other than the fact that I think it's a horrible decision.	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. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented California WaterFix project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Please also refer to Master Response 14 (Water Quality), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use), Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports/Area of Origin/Water Rights), Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply), and Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place).
388	1	When I look at the Delta tunnels, one of the concerns that I have is that it appears that we're using about a 20th century solution for 21st century problems. It kind of reminds me of when you have a traffic problem, and you think to solve it you should add another freeway, which works for a while, but it doesn't address the underlying issues of where people live and how far they need to go to get to work and school and things like that. So when we look at the tunnels, I'm encouraged to some of the changes that are trying to take into account, the environmental concerns that were in the previous versions, but I don't think that we've actually looked at the core problems underneath all of this. And as I look at the core problems, it has to do with how much water is there in California, and what can we do with it.	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.
388	2	It appears to me that in the agricultural sector we have, I think, ten million acres or so in production, and it's more than we really can manage. So as I look at it, I think we need to think about retiring some of the agricultural sector in California, and sharing that cost among all of us so that farmers are appropriately compensated, themselves, and their descendants.	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.
388	3	When I see the talent that's available, the engineering talent and the brilliance that is there in California, it would be wonderful to see that brilliance applied to creating more local solutions so that we're not trying to get rid of storm water while bringing in drinking water from far away. So could we start by looking at how much water and how much usage really is appropriate	Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. Although conservation components and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		in California? Getting more local engineering solutions in place? And then if we have to look at creating longer, you know, longer-term strategies or longer-distant strategies, then we can look at it at that time.	aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including storm water drainage. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.
388	4	I worry that by having the tunnels in place it will increase the pressure to raise the Shasta Dam on the federal side, which will drown out the Winnemem Wintu's cultural sites. And I hate to see cultural genocide, once again, against a small tribal community in California.	The proposed project for California WaterFix does not assume modification to Shasta Dam, as described in Chapter 3 of the EIR/EIS. Modification of Shasta Dam is being considered through the completion of separate environmental and engineering reports that are considered as part of the cumulative impact analysis in this EIR/EIS.
388	5	I think we need to look at what our limits are and what kind of creativity we can bring to bear. California can be a leader in a way that is definitely much more creative than going for a tunnels type of solution. I'd love to see the Governor, who does not need to be reelected, providing the leadership in that regard.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
389	1	Contra Costa County has requested the California Department of Water Resources provide us with all the updated reservoir and export operations and water quality modeling data used to prepare the REIR/SEIS. We sent a hard drive to the Department of Water Resources that was received on July 22, 2015. We have not yet received these modeling data. We will need additional time to carefully review these important modeling results.	Requested information has been provided to the commenter.
389	2	The spirit of both the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is grounded in fully disclosing the potential impacts of project actions so that we as a society can make sound decisions with respect to our communities and environment. The RDEIR/SDEIS amount to nearly 8,000 pages of additional documentation. Given the size and complexity of the document, and the need to refer back to the initial 40,000 pages, the current public comment period is not sufficient for an adequate review and thoughtful response.	Please see Master Response 39 for more information about the public review period. In order to facilitate a more easy review of the changes in the RDEIS/SDEIS compared to the Draft EIR/EIS, a version of the document was made available that included hyperlinks and track changes, in addition to a Section 508-compliant version

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		On behalf of [Contra Costa] County and all who live in the Delta, we respectfully request that the public comment period for the RDEIR/SDEIS be extended by a minimum of 60 days beyond the October 30, 2015 comment period deadline.	
390	1	How is moving water from point A to point B in the same state going to solve a water crisis? Here's an example: if Tony has a glass of water and Timmy also has a glass of water they're sitting at the same table and Timmy drinks all of his water so he borrows Tony's. But Tony then gets thirsty and Timmy already drank all of his water, how does Tony get water?	t 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. 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. Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need of the proposed project.
391	1	I am so concerned about the massive tunnels being planned to take water from the Sacramento River to the south state. Why are the big agribusiness planting nuts instead of sustainable crops? Because they are very lucrative! Why are we in the north subsidizing this? How will these tunnels help the Delta/San Francisco Bay? They won't. Both will be irrevocably harmed. With a completion date of some 12 to 14 years, how will this help our current drought? It won't. For whatever reason, Governor Brown is hell bent on building these tunnels for water transport that won't be there. At what cost? We know overruns are rampant in big public works projects. What a boondoggle all around, especially for the Delta and Bay region.	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. 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.
392	1	I would like to add my opposition to Governor Brown's twin tunnel proposal.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
393	1	I noticed the model DSM2 has been used to simulate the three new alternatives (2D, 4A, and 5A). I wonder whether it is possible to make the DSM2 model output data public. Checking the model output data will be really helpful in preparing comments. I remember all modeling data were made public during the review process of the last BDCP DEIR/DEIS. I hope the same type of modeling data can also be available at this time. .	The modeling data from the Draft EIR/EIS is still applicable to the RDEIR/SDIES. Supplemental modeling information for the RDEIR/SDEIS was provided in Appendix B, Supplemental Modeling for New Alternatives and Appendix C, Supplemental Modeling Requested by the State Water Resources Control Board Related to Increased Delta Outflows.
394	1	To spend $15 billion to move water which might not be there is not long-term thinking. How much is a desalination plant -- $1-2 billion? That would get us 7-10 plants up and down the coast. Why are we not looking in that direction instead of scarring the earth and environment for a plan that has been around for 30 years? This makes no sense. Only politicians will see this as a good idea. Please, be responsible and take a long-term view of California's water needs.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
395	1	We need to address these issues in a proactive manner. If we wait until things are reactive it is already too late. Having homes in the Bay Area and in the Central Valley I am extremely concerned about the water situation. The basic equation is no water = no life. Most of the Bay Area is doing their part to conserve water but when I look at how much of the Central Valley doesn't even have water meters, then to me, therein lies the disparity.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. Future water demands under the SWP and CVP water contract municipal uses are consistent with water demand projections in the recent Urban Water Management Plans submitted to DWR which include approaches to meet the 20 percent per capita urban water use by 2020. 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. It is consistent with other programs to provide continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation as well as other water supplies (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.
395	2	Everyone in other states seems to think "Oh it's a California problem", but in reality when the price of everything we can no longer produce starts to trickle through the agri based economic structure it will quickly become relevant to a large part of the United States. Another consideration is the possible exodus of millions of people from California to neighboring states. Most are not old enough to remember the Dustbowl in Oklahoma but there is a prime example in the somewhat recent past.	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.
395	3	It seems we should rethink the funding of "the train" as well. I voted for it, but have since reconsidered, especially since it is now billions of dollars more to accomplish what was set forth as well as where do we get the electricity for said train with no water. We don't even have the water to put out our fires, so at this point reallocation of that money into water infrastructure seems like not many would complain. Most of the problems have come from mismanagement of resources and the PG&E water rights grab dating back to the 1800s.	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.
395	4	As if fracking was not bad enough. If Central California keeps drilling deep water wells it will leave California in a giant sink hole and uninhabitable. The Aquifers also act as a geological movement dampening system. The lower water gets the more tectonic shifts will occur. The resulting geological shifts will be cataclysmic. Pay out of pocket now or pay with people's lives later. The warning signs are there.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. Senior water rights holders are not affected by implementation of action alternatives. The CALSIM II model assumptions provide the same deliveries to senior water rights holders under the No Action Alternative and all action alternatives. As discussed in Chapter 5, Water Supply, of the EIR/S, climate change, sea level rise, and population growth in the northern Delta watershed are anticipated to effect senior water rights holders (as shown in the comparison between the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative model runs) with or without implementation of the action alternatives. The 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). The proposed project would not increase the amount of water to which SWP and CVP hold water rights for use allowed under their contracts and permits and approvals for refuge water supplies or other environmental purposes. State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to stipulated beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows. Fracking – or "hydraulic fracturing" -- presumably could be an "industrial" use of water. As of the present, hydraulic fracturing is a lawful use of water, as state law generally permits oil and gas operators to engage in "the injection of air, gas, water, or other fluids into the productive strata, the application of pressure heat or other means for the reduction of viscosity of the hydrocarbons, the supplying of additional motive force, or the creating of enlarged or new channels for the underground movement of hydrocarbons into production wells[.]" (Cal. Pub. Resources Code, § 3106[b].) Pursuant to Senate Bill 4 from 2013 (Stats. 2013, Ch.313), moreover, the state Department of Conservation, through its Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR), is currently working on fracking regulations. An interim set of regulations allowing continued "well stimulation treatments" (including hydraulic fracturing) will remain in effect through 2014, and a new set of proposed regulations should take effect on January 2015. Senate Bill 4 also requires DOGGR, by July 1, 2015, to certify an EIR "in order to provide the public with detailed information regarding any potential environmental impacts of well stimulation in the state." This EIR "shall address the issue of activities… that may occur at oil wells in the state existing prior to, and after" January 1, 2014. Through the rule-making process and the statutorily-mandated EIR, the state will better understand how much water is actually used for fracking in California and how much is likely to be used in the foreseeable future. Voluntary reporting indicates that the use of water for fracking is comparatively small, particularly compared with the water usage that has been reported in other states in connection with natural gas recovery. The Department of Conservation estimates that statewide, about 270 acre-feet of water per year is used for hydraulic fracture stimulation activities. For comparison's sake, roughly 5.2 million acre-feet of water a year have been diverted from the Delta, on average, over the last 20 years by the federal and state water projects for farms and cities. The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) could modify water permits to balance and protect beneficial uses of water. If the Legislature declared fracking to be unreasonable, it would potentially trigger

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			the SWRCB to revise water right permits in such a way as to restrict Delta water from being used for fracking. Please see Master Response 34 for additional information regarding use of water delivered by project facilities.
397	1	I am writing to express frustration with another special interest protection folly by the Governor's administration (which includes many of you as appointeds--so I am not optimistic this letter will get a fair consideration). California policy sucks. California Water Fix (Alternative 4A) does not solve the underlying policy problems. The California Water Fix (Alternative 4A) is a special interest fix--it does not comprehensively address the waste and bad policies.	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/. 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. Refer to Master Response 3 for more information on the purpose and need for the proposed project. 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.
397	2	We must address reckless growth. Southern California has overgrown itself. It is a desert. While many people call Southern California home, it cannot be sustained by pumping local wells, capturing runoff or draining the Eastern Sierras. The bread basket Central Valley has outstripped resources even before the current severe conditions. We have tolerated water pig policy too long. We need to put development approvals under state review during the severe shortage period to determine whether the local county and city governments are approving projects without regard to water resources. If the water is not there, we need to stop the new projects.	Future water demands under the SWP and CVP water contract municipal uses are consistent with water demand projections in the recent Urban Water Management Plans submitted to DWR which include approaches to meet the 20 percent per capita urban water use by 2020. 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. It is consistent with other programs to provide continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation as well as other water supplies (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). 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. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
397	3	California needs to cover the aqueduct to stop needless and wasteful transevaporation. I suggested this to CWC [California Water Commission] over 12 years ago and that went nowhere. We'd have 50% more water in our reservoirs had the State done that.	Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. Although conservation components and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including storm water drainage. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.
397	4	Stop injecting fracking waste into our well recharge zones.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. 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.
397	5	Stop watering golf courses, even if it means compensating the operators. Stop watering landscape on the freeways. We did not need it before. We can't afford it now.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management). As described in Appendix 1C, recycled water is used for many purposes, including golf course irrigation, and other purposes, including freeway landscape irrigation.
397	6	Put a moratorium on new water intensive crops like alfalfa.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The SWP

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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. The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.
397	7	Prosecute, don't protect, industrial polluters.	The lead agencies acknowledge your comment. 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.
397	8	Start building desalination plants.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
397	9	Seed the clouds when they come over to increase precipitation.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
398	1	We do not need to suffer another dust bowl. We have the technology to recover destructive water from other places, and pipe it up Shasta. As you know, we lose millions [of dollars] because of the inability to get full use of our aqueduct. Let's be smart and manage our environment instead of spending [money] on disaster repair from floods. Create jobs like the dam projects that helped my grandfather become a successful businessman. He worked the Grand Coulee then Shasta and then had enough money to start a 40-year-[old] roofing company.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. 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.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).
399	1	I am writing to express my strong support to fix [our] water problem. I hold the city government, the state government and the feds [responsible] for not [having] [foresight] to build new holding tanks and fix the dams and not to punish the citizens of our state. Get it together and fix this [without] raising rates for water. It is time that the water department [needs] to reduce some of [its] staff or reduce pay rates to all, not increasing our rates.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
399	2	Start upgrading the infrastructure with reclaimed water to each home. Yes, it would cost a lot but it would be so good for our city down the road.	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 proposed project. 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. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management.