

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3000	1	Please consider the impacts to our ecosystem. Our Northern California wildlife, people, and waterway are already terminally struggling under the impacts of the drought! It is not right to only consider the needs of only half this State. We have reservoirs that are nearly empty, rivers that now could not even classify as streams. Our natural water resources are nearly depleted.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal and State regulating agencies, ESA compliance, and project design. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. 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.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).</p>
3001	1	Stop the tunnels. Do not steal our water or our fish. It will only make it harder on us fisherman and women. We need our water and our fish don't take either of them from us.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Conservation Measure 1 as a CM).</p>
3002	1	We should be able to find a better solution to California, especially Southern California's water shortage. Perhaps it's time to consider an evaluation of growth vs infrastructure and quality of life for all. This is way too destructive!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3003	1	<p>Please, please, these tunnels would be a disaster for California!</p> <p>We need a very different plan, one that will not cause so much destruction for the temporary benefit of just a few.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
3004	1	<p>Please do not take more water from the ailing but vitally important Delta system. There needs to be more conservation and more thinking on crops that are grown and farming practices, not more water diversions to Southern California. Save the Delta, it is vitally, important especially in the face of climate change.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 26 regarding changes in exports.</p> <p>The proposed project is just one element of the state’s long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including storm water drainage. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California’s water resources.</p> <p>The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the proposed project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan’s strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p>
3005	1	<p>It appears that the purpose of this plan is to drive the remaining salmon, smelt and other endangered or threatened species into extinction!</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need, describes the purpose of the California WaterFix.</p> <p>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.</p>
3006	1	<p>This is the worst idea ever! The Delta does not belong to Los Angeles and the corporate almond farmers. The tunnels will destroy the quality of life in the area they are built in. It is a huge expense. Some estimates exceed \$50 billion in total costs. And we get no new water from that. The idea that the tunnels will protect the water supply in the event of an earthquake is spurious at best. The delta would continue to flow after an earthquake and why would we expect tunnels built on a flood plain to survive a quake centered there? Please do not ruin the Delta with these tunnels.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The 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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>protect agricultural production in the Delta by securing agricultural easements and/or by seeking opportunities to protect and enhance agriculture with a focus on maintaining economic activity on agricultural lands. Please see Master Response 18 for more information on agricultural mitigation.</p> <p>For more information regarding cost of the proposed project please see Master Response 5.</p> <p>Chapter 9 of the 2013 BDCP Draft EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS describes the geology and seismicity of the study area. Based on a review of the last 20 years of precast tunnel lining seismic performance histories, it can be concluded that little or no damage to precast tunnel lining was observed for major earthquakes around the world. Based on preliminary data, it is anticipated that the Delta tunnels can be designed to withstand anticipated seismic loads. Design-level geotechnical studies would be conducted to assess site-specific hazards and appropriate mitigation measures would be implemented. Impact GEO- 1 and GEO-7 discusses the possibility of loss or damage resulting from strong seismic activity during construction and operation of water conveyance features. For more information regarding tunnel design please see the 2013 Conceptual Engineering Report.</p> <p>Please see Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS for discussion of potential consequences of an earthquake to exports under a No Action scenario.</p>
3007	1	<p>These tunnels are nothing, if not a water grab. The federal government and the state currently allow cheap water for wasteful farming on arid land, of year-round crops, and stick the people of California with the price tag. Now that Delta restoration is off the table, we see this project for what it truly is. This is our water. I do not need farmers in Westlands (i.e.Wastelands) to be growing year-round crops that are sent to Asia. We do not need corporations bottling our water for profit. We don't need hydraulic fracturing. If the state and the federal government managed the public's water properly we would not need these costly diversions that are not equitable, and are not beneficial to the places from which the water is taken, or where the dams are built or raised. Stop the madness. Do not build these costly, wasteful and destructive tunnels. The science is not on your side.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34. For more information regarding funding sources please see Master Response 5.</p>
3008	1	<p>The project's EIR suggests that with climate change, the increased exports of Delta water will further drain Northern California waters. Listed species will be impacted, as water stores continue to be robbed. This is not sustainable. It is hard to believe this project is consistent with the Governor's SGMA [Sustainable Groundwater Management Act] legislation.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Origin laws and requirements. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/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 in drier periods.</p> <p>As discussed in Chapter 5, Water Supply, of the EIR/EIS, climate change, sea level rise, and population growth in the northern Delta watershed are anticipated to affect all 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. Effects due to climate change are provided for informational purposes only and do not lead to mitigation.</p>
3009	1	I vote, and I will not be voting for those who authorize this. That simple. No to shipping more water to Southern California. They must keep growth tied to local water. Period.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
3010	1	On a recent visit to the Bay Delta area using Highway 12, I got a closer look at how valuable the ecosystem is. As THPO [Tribal Historic Preservation Officer] for a northern California Tribe, and one which has had good recent interactions with the Governor, I would implore you to listen to the voices of the Delta area Tribes, who have the incomparable knowledge of the area and whose voices should be heard in future management plans.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 21 (Tribal Issues).</p>
3011	1	The Delta Fix "California WaterFix" is a fraud. There are so many issues that the tunnel proponents aren't telling the public. For one, the extreme dewatering necessary to push the tunnels through. How will that affect the neighboring farms, etc.? There isn't enough water in the "river system" that there would even be enough water to go in the tunnels.	<p>As described in the EIR/EIS, during construction, slurry walls would be constructed around the construction site at the intakes, tunnel shafts, and forebays to reduce the effect of dewatering wells. Dewatering wells also would be installed at construction sites associated with levees without the use of slurry walls. No dewatering would be required along the tunnel alignment. The effects on groundwater at locations with slurry wall installations would not result in significant effects as compared to Existing Conditions. It is possible, that some impacts may result in effects depending upon specific information that would be collected during design and construction phase. Mitigation measures have been identified in the EIR/EIS to reduce the impacts to less than significant as compared to Existing Conditions. Mitigation Measures AG-1, GW-1, GW-5, and WQ-11 will reduce the severity of significant impacts in agricultural areas by implementing activities such as siting project footprints to encourage continued agricultural production; monitoring changes in groundwater levels during construction; monitoring seepage effects; relocating or replacing agricultural infrastructure in support of continued agricultural activities; identifying, evaluating, developing, and implementing feasible phased actions to reduce EC levels; engaging counties, owners/operators, and other stakeholders in developing optional agricultural stewardship approaches; and/or preserving</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			agricultural land through off-site easements or other agricultural land conservation interests.
3011	2	We need "storage", underground, above ground. "Desal" plans would help too. Recycling water too. All new homes should have a gray water and black water sewage systems.	Please see Master Response 7 regarding desalination, and 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.
3011	3	The state has a terrible history with mega projects, costs overruns – major overruns, on length of construction time too. Take the Bay Bridge, for example. And the High Speed Rail – money could be better spent. Dams not rails and/or tunnels.	DWR acknowledges your opposition to the project. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3012	1	<p>California's lifeline prevention from a water armageddon and will save the state over \$15 billion in unnecessary costs from the California Water Fix Alternative 4A (Twin Tunnels) proposal</p> <p>The Comprehensive Water Plan for California proposal will put adjustable hydraulic structures near Carquinez Bridge or east of Honker Bay to augment the State of California water supply and save the Delta.</p> <p>Half of all the freshwater runoff in California travels through the Delta. This Comprehensive Water Plan for California proposal provides adjustable hydraulic structures near Carquinez Bridge to save both Delta and Suisun Marsh or near Honker Bay to save the Delta. The adjustable hydraulic structures will constrict the water channel width during low flow to reduce the tidal exchange of the fresh water and salty sea water is termed "constricting the mouth of the Delta."</p> <p>Constricting the mouth of the Delta during droughts from a 3,300 feet water opening to at minimum of 100 feet opening during the drought will result in adding an approximately recurring 2,000,000 acre-feet/year of freshwater to our water supply currently being flushed into the sea to prevent seawater inundation of the Delta and Suisun Marsh. This is accomplished by reducing the Dayflow estimate of Delta outflow of fresh water by 80%, which is referred to as the "net Delta outflow index" (NDOI) or the daily average outflow more commonly. To put this in perspective, the result is approximately 250% (two-and-a-half times) the current State Water Project (SWP) allotment of 840,000 acre/ft freshwater or nearly 50% additional freshwater of the full allotment promised by the SWP. Additionally, it will bring more consistency and reliability to our water supply, improve water quality, safer for the environment, and a fraction of the time and cost to build compared to the proposed \$15.5 Billion California Water Fix Alternative 4A (Twin Tunnels) proposal.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives. 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 specific proposals that were considered but ultimately rejected by the Lead Agencies are discussed in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1. Appendix 3A thoroughly explains why various proposals were not analyzed in the EIR/EIS, including the NRDC Portfolio-Based Proposal, Congressman Garamendi's Water Plan, and other similar concepts that would require actions that are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including storm water drainage. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
3012	2	The California Water Fix Alternative 4A (Twin Tunnels) proposal will only reallocate better quality water to Southern California at the expense of deteriorating and degrading water quality within the Delta and harming the Delta environment, which is referred to as a "water grab."	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 to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project and Master Response 35 regarding water use in Southern California. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3012	3	ATT 1: Map of locations of proposed adjustable hydraulic structures nearby Carquinez	This 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Bridge and Honker Bay	already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
3012	4	ATT 2: Map of proposed locations of hydraulic structures at Carquinez Bridge and Honker Bay.	This 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 comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
3012	5	ATT 3: Picture of full aerial of Folsom Dam at 18% total capacity during this same time the previous two years.	This 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 comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
3012	6	ATT 4: Close-up of Folsom Dam at 18% total capacity or half the 36% of total capacity during this same time the previous two-years. Another year of same weather conditions and no major water usage reductions or conservation efforts will result in Folsom Lake being fully emptied. Photo taken September 2015.	This 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 comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
3012	7	ATT 5: Graph of reservoir conditions at midnight October 4, 2015.	This 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 comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
3012	8	ATT 6: Folsom Lake currently at 17% total capacity or nearly half the 32% historical average of total capacity. Another year of same weather conditions and no major water usage reductions or conservations will result in Folsom Lake being fully emptied.	This 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 comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
3012	9	ATT 7: Map of Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta	This 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 comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
3012	10	<p>This Op-Ed is to strongly urge the support of all Californians to contact the California Water Commission, California Department of Water Resources, Congressional Representatives, US Senators, State Legislators and to ultimately reach Governor Brown to reconsider the proposed latest July 13, 2015 revisions of the \$15.5 Billion Twin Tunnels that will not provide any additional water or solve our current water problems. Environmental groups rightfully blasted the newly renamed California WaterFix Alternative 4A (Twin Tunnels or the underground version of the previously rejected Peripheral Canal) proposal July 22, 2015 and stated "more alternatives needed instead of [a] 'water grab.'"</p> <p>This alternative proposal will work immediately in the short-term and bring a long-term comprehensive water plan for all Californians. The intended audience is for the State of California public that are being asked to support this Comprehensive Water Plan for California proposal. This proposal calls for adjustable hydraulic structures at the mouth of Delta to provide an approximately recurring 2,000,000 acre-feet/year of freshwater or 250% two-and-a-half times more than the current State Water Project (SWP) allocation of 840,000 acre-ft freshwater for all Californians that was increased March 2, 2015. This is the equivalent to providing more than twice the full capacity of Folsom Lake or nearly 50% additional freshwater of the full allotment promised by the State Water Project available every year for the Delta, State Water Project (SWP), and Central Valley Project (CVP).</p> <p>The Comprehensive Water Plan for California Proposal:</p>	<p>The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including storm water drainage. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Half of all the freshwater runoff in California travels through the Delta. This Comprehensive Water Plan for California proposal will put adjustable hydraulic structures at the mouth of Delta. The adjustable hydraulic structures will constrict the conveyance channel between the Sea and the Delta, which will reduce the tidal exchange of salty and fresh water that will save 80% of freshwater currently being wasted to the Sea to push back incoming salty ocean water and is termed "constricting the mouth of the Delta."</p> <p>Constricting the mouth of the Delta during droughts from a 3,300 feet water opening to at minimum of 100 feet opening during the drought will result in adding an approximately recurring 2,000,000 acre-feet/year of freshwater to our water supply currently being flushed into the Sea to prevent seawater inundation of the Delta and Suisun Marsh. This is accomplished by reducing the Dayflow estimate of Delta outflow of fresh water by 80%, which is referred to as the "net Delta outflow index" (NDOI) or the daily average outflow more commonly. To put this in perspective, the result is approximately 250% (two-and-a-half times) the current State Water Project allocation of 840,000 acre-feet freshwater for all Californians that was increased March 2, 2015 or nearly 50% additional freshwater of the full allotment promised by the SWP. The 100 feet continuous opening will provide the transition mixing zone of salinity, temperature, and density variation between the fresh water and the salty water essential for the fish. This proposal compared to the California WaterFix Alternative 4A (Twin Tunnels) proposal will provide much more freshwater supply, increased safety and water supply reliability, improve water quality in the Delta, relatively much cheaper, far easier to build, far more environmentally sound, allows controlling passage for navigation of ships during extreme droughts, and protects the Delta from increasing sea level due to climate change.</p>	
3012	11	<p>The California WaterFix Alternative 4A (Twin Tunnels) proposal cannot be built in time if our drought continues nor will it bring any additional water supply despite the massive resources are made. It will only reallocate better quality water to Southern California at the expense of deteriorating and degrading water quality within the Delta and harming the Delta environment, which is referred to as a "water grab."</p>	<p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project and Master Response 35 regarding water use in Southern California. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
3012	12	<p>Comparing the Proposals: Comprehensive Water Plan for California and California WaterFix Alternative 4A (Twin Tunnels) proposals.</p> <p>The California WaterFix Alternative 4A (Twin Tunnels) proposal will not solve our current water problems. It will provide no additional water, no additional water supply reliability, degrade water quality by leaving nearly one billion pounds of salt within the Delta by removing fresher water from upstream and decreasing productivity of farmlands in the Delta, far too costly both financially and environmentally, will take too long to build, and provides no protection against levee/earthquake breaks or sea level rise due to climate change that will inundate the Delta by salty Ocean water (see table ATT 8).</p> <p>It does not need to be a zero-sum game. We can actually raise the freshwater supply level and help all Californians. All boats will float higher so to speak. Now you know</p>	<p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		the facts that will help all of California. Go back to the top and click the links and write the people in charge to send your support for this Comprehensive Water Plan for California proposal. Go get everyone on the same page and I am here to make sure this is done right and timely so we all can continue to enjoy the California Sun and Water.	
3012	13	ATT 8: Table: Comparing the Comprehensive Water Plan for California and California WaterFix Alternative 4A (Twin Tunnels) proposals.	This 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 comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
3013	1	<p>The application to the USACE [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers] is premature and was submitted while decision-makers and the public were still reviewing draft environmental documents for the proposed project. Our [Contra Costa County Water Agency's] review of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP)/California WaterFix (CWF) partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report/Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (RDEIR/SDEIS) that was released to the public on July 10, 2015 has found numerous flaws and inadequacies that make it impossible for decision-makers like the USACE or the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) to make a reasoned decision.</p> <p>As stated in the Delta Independent Science Board's September 30, 2015 comment letter (Attachment 4 [ATT6]), the Independent Science Board indicates in no uncertain terms that the RDEIR/SDEIS is "sufficiently incomplete and opaque to deter its evaluation and use by decision makers, resource managers, scientists and the broader public."</p>	The comment does not provide the specific "flaws and inadequacies" of the environmental review documents. For responses to comments related to the Delta Independent Science Board's letters, please refer to comment letters BDCP 1448 and/or RECIRC 2546. Also, see Master Response 45 regarding other permitting.
3013	2	<p>The SWRCB in its October 30, 2015 comment letter (Attachment 3 [ATT5]) criticized the RDEIR/SDEIS for only optimizing the preferred alternative which is a variant on the original Peripheral Canal proposal and not optimizing or developing an alternative requested by the SWRCB that would have included increased flows for fish. The SWRCB notes that only limited time was given to their requested higher flow alternative. The RDEIR/SDEIS failed to present any graphs of the ratio of Delta outflows, Sacramento inflows and San Joaquin inflows to unimpaired flows to allow decision-makers and the public to compare the WaterFix flow ratios with the SWRCB's 2010 Delta Flow Criteria. The SWRCB-requested alternative has the potential to be a least environmentally damaging practicable alternative, but was not given serious consideration by DWR and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation).</p>	Please see Appendix 5E in the FEIR/EIS for supplemental modeling requested by the State Water Resources Control Board related to increased delta outflows.
3013	3	<p>The WaterFix application to the USACE [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers] is "supported" by draft environmental documents that are wholly inadequate. The following [is an] example of the major problems with the current WaterFix project proposal:</p> <p>The preferred alternative in the current RDEIR/SDEIS fails to achieve either of the two coequal goals of "providing a more reliable water supply for California and protecting, restoring, and enhancing the Delta ecosystem." (See Wat. Code, [Sections] 85054; 85301(a).) This renders the RDEIR/SDEIS noncompliant with the requirements of the state Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Reform Act of 2009 (Wat. Code, [Sections] 85000-85350) and Division B, Title 2, Section 205 of the federal Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2012 (Pub. L. 112-74 (Dec. 23, 2011) 125 Stat. 786).</p>	<p>For more information on the proposed project's compatibility with the Delta Reform Act and the Delta Plan, please see Appendix 3J, FEIR/EIS and Master Response 31 (Delta Reform Act).</p> <p>As explained in Final EIR/EIS Appendix 3A "Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives", the alternative development process for the EIR/EIS was based upon a number of legal considerations including: (1) the legal requirements for adequate discussions of alternatives in an EIR and EIS, as set forth in CEQA and NEPA respectively, and the regulations and case law interpreting those statutory schemes; (2) the concepts of "potential feasibility" under CEQA and "reasonableness" under NEPA; and (3) the requirements of Water Code Section 85320 from the 2009 Delta Reform Act. The results of a multi-level screening process reflecting these considerations were further compared to the requirements of the Delta Reform Act and scoping comments related to the definition of potential EIR/EIS alternatives as identified by responsible and cooperating agencies under CEQA and NEPA, respectively. Finally, the potential alternatives were evaluated to determine if they would require changes in legal rights, including water rights, of entities that are not participants in the proposed project in a way that could not lawfully or practically be accomplished through</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			the mechanism of an HCP/NCCP or Section 7 alternatives (please note that the new preferred alternative, 4A, will not act as an HCP/NCCP, but will rather achieve incidental take coverage through the ESA Section 7 and CESA 2081(b) permitting processes). For additional information on the alternatives screening process and the selection of alternatives, see Final EIR/EIS Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, Draft EIR/EIS Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives, RDEIR/SDEIS Section 4 New Alternatives, and Master Response 4 (Alternatives).
3013	4	<p>The WaterFix application to the USACE [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers] is "supported" by draft environmental documents that are wholly inadequate. The following [is an] example of the major problems with the current WaterFix project proposal:</p> <p>The DWR and the California Natural Resource Agency (CNRA) and Reclamation have allowed the export water contractors to develop a flawed project and valuable input from Delta interests and environmental organizations and even other State Agencies (e.g. Delta Stewardship Council Independent Science Board) [has] gone unanswered.</p>	No specific comments regarding requested revisions of the EIR/EIS are provided in this comment. All of the public, agency and stakeholder comments received over an extensive environmental review process have been considered and all of the comments received during public review periods for the Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS have received responses. Please see Master Responses 40, 41, and 42 regarding public outreach, transparency, and public comments, respectively. Also, see Master Response 4 regarding alternatives development. For responses to comments related to the Delta Independent Science Board's letters, please refer to comment letters BDCP 1448 and/or RECIRC 2546.
3013	5	<p>The WaterFix application to the USACE [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers] is "supported" by draft environmental documents that are wholly inadequate. The following [is an] example of the major problems with the current WaterFix project proposal:</p> <p>DWR, CNRA [California Natural Resource Agency], Reclamation and Interior have failed to consider or analyze a reasonable range of alternatives. Fourteen (14) of the 15 alternatives in the draft RDEIR/SDEIS involve an isolated facility and north Delta intakes, with no new storage or actions to reduce demand on the Delta and increase local sources of water. The three new alternatives in the RDEIR/SDEIS have the same basic configuration as those 14, meaning 17 out of 18 project alternatives are essentially the same project alternative. These project alternatives do not foster informed decision-making, and do not permit a reasoned choice.</p>	<p>Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. 15 alternatives and 3 new subalternatives are analyzed in the FEIR/EIS. Four major alignments have been included in the EIR/S: Through-Delta, East of the Sacramento River, West of the Sacramento River, and a Tunnel under the Delta. Many additional proposals by public and private individuals and organizations have also been evaluated and described in Chapter 3 of the EIR/S and Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1.</p> <p>Regarding development of alternatives for the EIR/EIS, a description of the process the Lead Agencies followed to develop and screen alternatives is provided in Master Response 4.</p>
3013	6	<p>The WaterFix application to the USACE [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers] is "supported" by draft environmental documents that are wholly inadequate. The following [is an] example of the major problems with the current WaterFix project proposal:</p> <p>The current RDEIR/SDEIS preferred alternative still relies on exports from the existing south Delta export locations (especially in dry years when the Delta is most stressed) and often would result in worse reverse flows in Old and Middle Rivers. The new north Delta intakes also adversely impact listed fish species (i.e., species listed as threatened and endangered under the state and federal Endangered Species Acts) by reducing flows through the Delta to San Francisco Bay, reducing the percentage of flow through Sutter and Steamboat Sloughs, and increasing predation. Therefore, the project's net benefits to listed fish species are minimal, if any.</p>	<p>The benefits and effects of the proposed project on aquatic species are described in Ch 11. As described in Appendix 5A of the FEIR/EIS, the numerical models cannot be used in a predictive manner to define absolute values. Rather, they must be used in a comparative manner to indicate overall changes between alternatives as compared to the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative. As shown in Appendix 5A, Section C, the Old and Middle River flows under Alternative 4A would be more positive than under the No Action Alternative and Existing Conditions except in April and May except in wet years. The model results indicate that in these months, the increased reverse Old and Middle River flows would range from approximately -119 to -427 cfs under Alternative 4A as compared to the No Action Alternative, and from approximately -72 to -748 cfs as compared to the Existing Conditions which includes the effects due to climate change and sea level rise. It should be noted modeling for Alternative 4A was conducted for Operational Scenario H3+, a point that generally falls between Scenario H3 and H4 operations, as the initial conveyance facilities operational scenario. Actual operations will be determined by the Endangered Species Act and California Endangered Species Act Section 2081 permits, and would likely fall be between Scenarios H3 and H4.</p> <p>The NDD operational criteria, including transitional criteria to allow adjustments when fish are present, combined with substantial reduction in entrainment at the south Delta, provide improved protection of fish compared to current export operations. The net effects of predation are uncertain, but the Adaptive Management Program will be used to better understand and manage this ongoing issue in the Delta.</p>
3013	7	The WaterFix application to the USACE [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers] is "supported" by draft environmental documents that are wholly inadequate. The following [is an]	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>example of the major problems with the current WaterFix project proposal:</p> <p>Astonishingly, the RDEIR/SDEIS's preferred alternative would increase exports in dry periods and would only infrequently capture additional surplus water in wet periods. This is completely contrary to the original BDCP planning principles and the "Big Gulp, Little Sip" concept touted in the BDCP "An Overview and Update" dated March 2009. Specifically, principle #2 states "Divert more water in the wetter periods and less in the drier periods." Moreover, the preferred alternative is in direct conflict with State policies of reducing reliance on the Delta in meeting California's future water supply needs. (See Wat. Code, [Sections] 10608(c) & 85021.)</p>	<p>input.</p> <p>The Final EIR/EIS includes model results for Alternative 4A at ELT conditions as compared to the No Action Alternative at ELT conditions and compared to Existing Conditions. The results are presented in Appendix 5A, Section C, in addition to the model results previously provided in the Draft EIR/EIS. The comparative results between Alternative 4A and the No Action Alternative and the Existing Conditions are generally consistent with the impact analysis results presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS.</p> <p>Overall, the models results indicate the proposed project (Alternative 4A) 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 especially in drier years; and increase exports in the wet winter months especially in wetter years when the river flows are high. As presented in Chapter 5 and Appendix 5A, Section C, of the Final EIR/EIS, the rate of total Delta export flows would be similar or lower in August through November in all water year types and in July in dry and critical dry water year types as compared to Existing Conditions and to the No Action Alternative. With respect to volume of total Delta exports, total Delta exports would be similar or lower in August through November in all water year types and in July in dry and critical dry water year types as compared to Existing Conditions and to the No Action Alternative. The model results for Alternative 4A indicate that flows and export volumes would increase in wet, above normal, and below normal years between December and March and in June and July as compared to the Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative. Export rates and volumes would not substantially change in April and May.</p>
3013	8	<p>The WaterFix application to the USACE [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers] is "supported" by draft environmental documents that are wholly inadequate. The following [is an] example of the major problems with the current WaterFix project proposal:</p> <p>The Operations and Water Quality modeling for the November, 2013 BDCP Draft EIR/EIS contained major errors and the computer models needed to be revised. However, no new modeling was done for the new RDEIR/SDEIS project or project alternatives. Instead DWR and Reclamation have based their RDEIR/SDEIS analyses on the original flawed modeling studies from three-and-a-half years ago, and on brief water quality "sensitivity analyses" performed for completely different future demand, climate change scenarios, and habitat restoration conditions, i.e., late long-term rather than early long-term.</p>	<p>The Final EIR/EIS includes model results for Alternatives 2D, 4A, and 5A as compared to the No Action Alternative and Existing Conditions in Appendix 5A, Section C, in addition to the model results previously provided in the Draft EIR/EIS. The comparative results between Alternatives 2D, 4A, and 5A and the No Action Alternative and the Existing Conditions are generally consistent with the impact analysis results presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS.</p> <p>It is assumed that this comment is also referring to comments submitted by Contra Costa County and Contra Costa Water District related to the use of 2010 CALSIM model. Modeling for the EIR/EIS has been based on the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and Alternative 1 models developed in April – May of 2010 (2010 models), which were the state-of-the-art at the time, and formed the basis for universal assumptions in the other action alternatives in the EIR/EIS. However, in August 2011 several model improvements were identified by the water agencies, fishery agencies, and the modeling community. The identified improvements were compiled, and the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and Alternative 1 models were updated in coordination with DWR, Reclamation and USFWS. This update was performed to verify if the compiled model improvements altered the incremental changes between Alternative 1 and the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative relative to the 2010 models. The findings from the 2011 update showed that the incremental differences between Alternative 1 and the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative remained consistent with the 2010 modeling. Therefore, the action alternatives modeled since 2011 continued to rely on the 2010 modeling, allowing consistency and comparability throughout the EIR/EIS. Similarly, when Alternative 4A was modeled using the 2013 baseline, the incremental changes in the operational results for Alternative 4A as compared to the No Action Alternative were similar to the prior incremental results between the 2010 modeling for the No Action Alternative and Alternative 4A. It should be noted that the modeling used in the EIR/EIS must be used in a comparative manner and not to define absolute values.</p>
3013	9	<p>The WaterFix application to the USACE [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers] is "supported" by draft environmental documents that are wholly inadequate. The following [is an] example of the major problems with the current WaterFix project proposal:</p> <p>The estimated \$15 billion cost for construction of the tunnels does not represent the</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on the costs of project implementation.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>total cost of the whole project, estimated upwards of \$50 billion, and would most likely be rendered obsolete once the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) adopts long-overdue, more stringent, Delta flow requirements to protect fish and other beneficial uses.</p>	
3013	10	<p>Proposed WaterFix project violates existing USACE [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers] limits on inflow to Clifton Court.</p> <p>A detailed review of the WaterFix sensitivity analysis data for Alternative 4A reveals that the monthly exports from the south Delta exceeded the USACE limits on inflow to Clifton Court Forebay from the south Delta. These sensitivity analysis data were provided to Contra Costa County by DWR. As described on page 5A-B6 of the BDCP Draft EIR/EIS, the USACE limits daily diversion into Clifton Court Forebay to 6,680 cfs [cubic feet per second] (specified as a three-day average daily diversion of 13,250 acre-feet). Higher inflows are permitted from mid-December to mid-March when the flow of the San Joaquin River at Vernalis exceeds 1,000 cfs. An additional 500 cfs is also permitted for July-September to reduce National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) biological opinion impacts.</p> <p>Figure 1 [ATT1] shows the WaterFix analysis State Water Project (SWP) south Delta export data for Alternative 4A, Scenario H3, at early long term, for April through November when the USACE limits of 6,680 cfs apply. The simulated inflows to Clifton Court (SWP through-Delta exports) are as high as 9,750 cfs with total south Delta export as high as 14,350 cfs. This is well in excess of the permitted values for this period, and is inconsistent with the WaterFix project's claim of reduced exports from the south Delta that contribute to ecosystem benefits.</p> <p>The WaterFix RDEIR/SDEIS is inadequate because it fails to clearly disclose to the public and to decision-makers like the USACE that DWR is proposing to eliminate existing limits on the inflow to Clifton Court, and that the analyses to support the USACE application violates that limit. DWR's Clean Water Act Section 404 application to the USACE is also inadequate and deceiving because it fails to inform decision-makers and the public that DWR intends to ignore the USACE limits on inflow to Clifton Court Forebay. If DWR does intend to comply with the USACE limits, the application is incomplete because no full model runs were performed for the proposed project and the analyses that were done exceed and violate the Clifton Court Forebay inflow limits.</p> <p>Revised versions of Chapter 3 do not indicate any deletion of the language from the BDCP Draft EIR/EIS Chapter 3 acknowledging that the USACE limits were assumed to not apply. DWR and Reclamation deleted the references in BDCP Draft EIR/EIS Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives (pages 3-32 and Table 3-5 on 3-36) without acknowledging it in their revisions to Alternative 3 (in RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A).</p> <p>Figure 2 [ATT2] shows the same SWP south Delta export data as Figure 1, but this time plotted as a function of Delta outflow. The violations of the USACE limits occur during drier months when Delta outflows are lower. This is again directly contrary to the principle of taking a "Little Sip" during drier periods, i.e., reducing exports relative to existing levels.</p> <p>DWR's August 24, 2015 application to the USACE should have been, and still should be, rejected with the request that a new Draft EIR/EIS is prepared that includes new</p>	<p>The Final EIR/EIS includes model results for Alternative 4A at ELT conditions as compared to the No Action Alternative at ELT conditions and compared to Existing Conditions. The results are presented in Appendix 5A, Section C, in addition to the model results previously provided in the Draft EIR/EIS. The comparative results between Alternative 4A and the No Action Alternative and the Existing Conditions are generally consistent with the impact analysis results presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS.</p> <p>Under the Proposed Project (Alternative 4A), the model assumptions maintained the existing diversion limits at Clifton Court Forebay per the USACE agreements. The export of up to 10,300 cfs of SWP water in the wetter months is based upon conveyance through the Banks Pumping Plant of water diverted at the north and south Delta intakes.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>alternatives that comply with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers limits on inflow to Clifton Court Forebay, and other legal requirements set by the SWRCB and the biological opinion. As discussed in detail in the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) October 30, 2015 comments on the RDEIR/SDEIS (Attachment 2 [ATT4]), Endangered Species Act (ESA) Section 7 consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service regarding the construction and operation of new conveyance facilities is underway but not complete. Additional information is being generated to identify criteria for operating the new WaterFix facilities, to be included in the Biological Opinions and Incidental Take Permits. EPA stated that "this information and such operating criteria could result in environmental impacts that have not been analyzed in the SDEIS."</p> <p>Until all these factors are included in a new Draft EIR/EIS and the new Draft is fully reviewed by decision makers and the public, and completed as Final EIR/EIS, it will not be possible for the USACE to fully comprehend the environmental impacts of the proposed WaterFix project.</p>	
3013	11	[ATT1: Figure 1. Monthly SWP exports from the south Delta for the WaterFix preferred alternative (Alternative 4A, Scenario H3 at Early Long Term) for the period October 1921 through September 2003.]	This 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 comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
3013	12	[ATT2: Figure 2: Monthly SWP exports from the south Delta as a function of Delta outflow for the WaterFix preferred alternative (Alternative 4A, Scenario H3 at Early Long Term).]	This 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 comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
3013	13	<p>The California WaterFix proposal to incorporate an operable Head of Old River Barrier is highly problematic.</p> <p>The USACE [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers] notice states that the CWF [California WaterFix] proposed project would include a permanent operable barrier at the head of Old River. After several flawed draft EIR/EIS documents, DWR released a final EIR/EIS for the South Delta Improvements Project (SDIP) in December 2006. On December 15, 2006, DWR certified the South Delta Improvements Project Final EIR. DWR only proposed moving forward with stage one, to install permanent gates that will replace temporary structures installed and removed each year. DWR stated that any activity regarding stage two, which involved increasing SWP exports above the USACE limits (typically 6,680 cfs [cubic feet per second]) to 8,500 cfs, will require further study and public input. It is not clear whether the federal government ever issued a Record of Decision (ROD) for the SDIP FEIS because DWR suspended the SDIP project shortly thereafter.</p> <p>The WaterFix RDEIR/SDEIS for the CWF does not contain sufficient information for the public and affected parties to determine the specific impacts of the Head of Old River Barrier (e.g., on water quality and resident fish passage in the south Delta) and of increasing inflow to the unscreened Clifton Court intake (e.g., of the decreasing numbers of pelagic organisms and anadromous fish).</p>	<p>New south Delta diversion criteria are based on the current FWS and NMFS Biological Opinions (2008, 2009), which included RPAs to mitigate and minimize effects of Delta operations on fish, although the proposed criteria includes additional restrictions. Alternative 4A includes the permanent operable gate at the head of Old River, which would be operated to promote survival of out-migrating steelhead and Chinook salmon from the San Joaquin River. In wetter years, Alternative 4A operating criteria would allow more pumping at the NDD facilities and less in the south Delta. Overall entrainment of listed fish species, and associated predation, would be reduced in the south Delta. See Chapter 11, FEIR/EIS for more details.</p> <p>For specific information on the effects of the Head of Old River Barrier on water quality, please refer to chapter 8, Section 8.3.4, FEIR/EIS, specifically the discussion regarding San Joaquin River at Prisoners Point, and associated Mitigation Measure WQ-11f. In summary, by adaptively managing the Head of Old River Barrier and the fraction of south Delta versus north Delta diversions, EC levels at Prisoners Point would likely be decreased to a level that would not adversely affect aquatic life beneficial uses.</p> <p>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.</p>
3013	14	The existing south Delta export intakes would continue to harm key fish species because the south Delta would still be used for 51% of the exports. The BDCP and CWF [California WaterFix] proponents are intending to increase diversions, rather than	Alternative 4 remains a viable option. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP component. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. DWR and Reclamation maintain that the new preferred alternative continues to meet the co-equal goals of a reliable

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>decrease diversions, at Clifton Court Forebay (USACE [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers] limits), which would remain unscreened.</p> <p>Despite this continued, sometimes, increased use of the south Delta export intakes, DWR and Reclamation claim the CWF benefits fish by minimizing reverse flows in the south Delta. However, they are not willing to back that up by agreeing to Old and Middle River (OMR) limits that correspond to no, or very little, reverse flow year round, say, for example, OMR > -2,000 cfs [cubic feet per second]. There are resident fish in the south and central Delta year round that need to be protected every month. Limiting OMR in only a few key months will shift the impacts to other months and start the decline of other Delta fish species. Even an OMR limit of -5,000 cfs represents a significant reverse flow that will still harm Delta fish. The WaterFix analysis data provided by DWR shows that reverse flows would still be as large as -14,000 cfs and even increase in some months as a result of the WaterFix project. This is not the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative.</p> <p>The proposed north Delta intakes and operating rules will also harm key fish species by reducing flows downstream of the intakes which also increases predation and reduces survival, altering the olfactory cues for returning salmon and steelhead, and impinging and entraining fish at the new screened intakes. The problems with the north Delta intakes were acknowledged in the November 2013 Draft BDCP Executive Summary. Because the CWF no longer includes any significant habitat restoration, DWR and Reclamation can no longer assume habitat restoration will offset those adverse north Delta impacts on key fish species.</p> <p>If reverse flows in the south Delta that draw anadromous fish out of the north Delta are bad, why would DWR and Reclamation instead move the intakes to the north Delta closer to the fish they claim to be protecting?</p> <p>The north Delta intakes will also cause reverse flows in Sutter and Steamboat Sloughs that will significantly harm migrating fish. The BDCP Draft EIR/EIS argued these reverse flows would be eliminated by the habitat restoration (in the Cache Slough region). However, the CWF no longer includes any appreciable habitat restoration.</p>	<p>water supply and a restored Delta ecosystem to benefit all water users.</p> <p>The Final EIR/EIS includes model results for Alternative 4A at ELT conditions as compared to the No Action Alternative at ELT conditions and compared to Existing Conditions. The results are presented in Appendix 5A, Section C, in addition to the model results previously provided in the Draft EIR/EIS. The comparative results between Alternative 4A and the No Action Alternative and the Existing Conditions are generally consistent with the impact analysis results presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS.</p> <p>Under the Proposed Project (Alternative 4A), the model assumptions maintained the existing diversion limits at Clifton Court Forebay per the USACE agreements. The export of up to 10,300 cfs of SWP water in the wetter months is based upon conveyance through the Banks Pumping Plant of water diverted at the north and south Delta intakes.</p> <p>As described in Appendix 5A of the FEIR/EIS, the numerical models cannot be used in a predictive manner to define absolute values. Rather, they must be used in a comparative manner to indicate overall changes between alternatives as compared to the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative. As shown in Appendix 5A, Section C, modeled Old and Middle River flows under Alternative 4A would be more positive than under the No Action Alternative and Existing Conditions except in April and May except in wet years. The model results indicate that in these months, the increased reverse Old and Middle River flows would range from approximately -119 to -427 cfs under Alternative 4A as compared to the No Action Alternative, and from approximately -72 to -748 cfs as compared to the Existing Conditions which includes the effects due to climate change and sea level rise. The purpose and need of the proposed project was to minimize the effects of the action alternatives as compared to the No Action Alternative, and not to eliminate reverse flows.</p> <p>The CALSIM II model assumptions related to the North Delta Bypass Flows were specifically developed to reduce or eliminate diversions at the north Delta intakes during periods that would cause reverse flow patterns along the Sacramento River and adjacent tributaries, including Sutter and Steamboat sloughs (see Appendix 5A, Section B, of the FEIR/EIS). Therefore, tidal flows in the Sacramento River would be similar under the action alternatives and the No Action Alternative and adjacent tributaries, including Sutter and Steamboat sloughs. Also, see Chapter 11 of the FEIR/EIS for information on potential effects to migrating salmonids due to NDD operations.</p>
3013	15	<p>The California WaterFix project will cause significant adverse impacts to water quality in the Delta.</p> <p>The BDCP Draft EIR/EIS found that the proposed project would cause significant adverse impacts on water quality in the Delta, but deemed these significant impacts "unavoidable." The WaterFix RDEIR/SDEIS now finds there are fewer significant adverse impacts on Delta water quality and fails to propose any binding actions to avoid or mitigate water quality impacts. As discussed in detail in Contra Costa Water District's September 30, 2015 comments (Attachment 5 [ATT7]), DWR uses an incorrect baseline (without Fall X2) and provides additional outflow above those needed to meet SWRCB D-1641 and Fall X2 requirements in October in the with-project case. The erroneous baseline makes Delta water quality worse than under existing conditions and the additional October outflows make the with-project water quality better than it would actually be with the WaterFix project. The RDEIR/SDEIS acknowledges future habitat restoration under EcoRestore and other future projects will contribute to degradation of Delta water quality, but neither these habitat restoration actions nor the actual WaterFix preferred alternative are analyzed using full model runs. The significant water</p>	<p>The FEIR/EIS assesses impacts to the environment due to California WaterFix; tidal habitat restoration California EcoRestore is unassociated with any habitat restoration that may be required as part of the construction and operation of new Delta water conveyance facilities under WaterFix. The area of habitat restoration for WaterFix is limited in size, relative to the Delta as a whole, and thus was not included in modeling of Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A so as to isolate and assess effects of the conveyance facility on water quality. Please see Master Response 14 which addresses water quality analyses, including anti-degradation policies. The rationale for defining existing conditions as the conditions at the time of the notice of preparation is fully explained in Chapter 4, Approach to the Environmental Analysis, Section 4.2.1.1, FEIR/EIS. Please also refer to master response 1, which addresses the environmental baselines used in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Please see master response 30 for information regarding modeling. For more information regarding the proposed project's compliance with the Delta Reform Act please see Master Response 31. Also, see Mitigation Measure WQ-7e in Chapter 8 of the FEIR/EIS regarding the Contra Costa Water District Settlement Agreement which will reduce potential water quality effects.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		quality degradation in the Delta due to the proposed project is contrary to state and federal antidegradation statutes and the 2009 Delta Reform Act.	
3013	16	<p>The claims made by California WaterFix [CWF] project proponents are refuted by the analyses.</p> <p>The CWF project proponents claim the project will benefit the Delta ecosystem by reducing exports from the south Delta, minimizing reverse flows in the south Delta, and capturing more water in wet years, while also increasing water supply reliability (at least for south-of-Delta export contractors.) As discussed in detail in Contra Costa County's October 30, 2015 comments on the RDEIR/SDEIS none of these benefits will actually occur. The south Delta export intakes will still be used for 50% of the total exports. Because the proposed project does not include any new storage, the project is unable to capture "new" water when flows in the Delta are very high (wet months) and would rely instead on increasing exports well above existing levels in dry months when Delta outflows are very low and the Delta is already stressed.</p>	<p>The Final EIR/EIS includes model results for Alternative 4A at ELT conditions as compared to the No Action Alternative at ELT conditions and compared to Existing Conditions. The results are presented in Appendix 5A, Section C, in addition to the model results previously provided in the Draft EIR/EIS. The comparative results between Alternative 4A and the No Action Alternative and the Existing Conditions are generally consistent with the impact analysis results presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS.</p> <p>The Final EIR/EIS includes model results specifically for Alternative 4A as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative. These results indicate that total Delta exports under Alternative 4A are approximately 6 percent higher in wet years and 3 percent lower in critical dry years as compared to the No Action Alternative. The results also indicate that total Delta exports under Alternative 4A are similar in wet years and 18 percent lower in critical dry years as compared to the Existing Conditions which includes changes due to climate change, sea level rise, and population growth.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 37 regarding additional storage.</p>
3013	17	<p>The California WaterFix project is not consistent with State and Federal statutes.</p> <p>State and Federal law (Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Reform Act of 2009 (Wat. Code, [Sections] 85000-85350) and Division B, Title 2, Section 205 of the federal Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2012 (Pub. L. 112-74 (Dec. 23, 2011) 125 Stat. 786)) require achievement of coequal goals, including the inherent objectives of improving water quality in the Delta and protecting the Delta as a place. It is no longer sufficient to merely "balance" beneficial uses of water. Bay-Delta projects that do not help to achieve both coequal goals and the inherent objective of improving Delta water quality do not help advance California's need for a sustainable Delta solution, and [are] not consistent with the State and Federal statutes.</p>	<p>Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. The proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <p>For more information regarding the proposed project's compliance with the Delta Reform Act please see Master Response 31 and Appendix 3J, FEIR/EIS.</p>
3013	18	<p>The California WaterFix [CWF] RDEIR/SDEIS fails to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives.</p> <p>The 2009 Delta Reform Act, CEQA and NEPA require analysis of a reasonable range of alternatives. Seventeen of the 18 alternatives are essentially the same alternative. The only different alternative is modified through Delta conveyance (Alternative 9). None of the alternatives that have been analyzed are compatible with the SWRCB's 2010 Delta Flow Criteria. Two alternatives requested by the SWRCB that included increased Delta flows (BDCP Alternative 8 and WaterFix Alternative 4H3) were not properly optimized or analyzed. The basic CWF alternative was not optimized by adding new storage, reducing demand through water conservation actions, or investigating other intake locations. None of the BDCP and CWF alternatives represent a Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding alternative development, and Appendix 5E for supplemental modeling requested by the State Water Resource Control Board related to increased outflows. Also, see Master Responses 6 and 37 regarding demand management and additional storage, respectively.</p>
3013	19	<p>California WaterFix [CWF] environmental documents fail to disclose serious problems with the project.</p> <p>The RDEIR/SDEIS hides and fails to clearly disclose problems with proposed CWF operations. The graphical presentations are insufficient to inform and fully disclose to</p>	<p>For responses to comments related to the Delta Independent Science Board's letters, please refer to comment letters BDCP 1448 and/or RECIRC 2546.</p> <p>As described in the response to 3013-16, the Final EIR/EIS includes model results for Alternative 4A at ELT conditions as compared to the No Action Alternative at ELT conditions and compared to Existing Conditions.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>regulators, the significant adverse impacts of the preferred alternative (as noted by Delta Independent Science Board in their September 30, 2015 comments). WaterFix would increase exports in driest months when Delta outflows are very low and Delta ecosystem is most stressed. The RDEIR/SDEIS does mention that the project proponents are reinterpreting the SWRCB's D-1641 export/inflow ratio standards, but it is not made clear to regulators and decision makers that this sometimes results in more of the Delta inflow being exported than permitted by the SWRCB D-1641 standards. The Head of Old River barrier impacts on the movement of Delta smelt and on Delta water quality are not disclosed separately from all the other proposed changes to the Delta infrastructure and operations, and due to climate change.</p>	<p>The results are presented in Appendix 5A, Section C, in addition to the model results previously provided in the Draft EIR/EIS. The comparative results between Alternative 4A and the No Action Alternative and the Existing Conditions are generally consistent with the impact analysis results presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS.</p> <p>The Final EIR/EIS includes model results specifically for Alternative 4A as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative. These results indicate that total Delta exports under Alternative 4A are approximately 6 percent higher in wet years and 3 percent lower in critical dry years as compared to the No Action Alternative. The results also indicate that total Delta exports under Alternative 4A are similar in wet years and 18 percent lower in critical dry years as compared to the Existing Conditions which includes changes due to climate change, sea level rise, and population growth.</p> <p>The Export/Inflow ratio requirements used in most of the alternatives in the EIR/EIS were defined as in the State Water Resources Control Board Decision 1641 (developed without the concept of the north Delta intakes) with the Exports defined at the south Delta intakes, and the inflows defined at a location downstream of the proposed north Delta intakes. Alternative 4H4 modified the Export/Inflow definition to include the north Delta and south Delta intakes in the Export value, and moved the Inflow location upstream of the north Delta intakes. With respect to Alternative 4A, the Inflow value does not include the north Delta intake diversions because these diversions would be regulated by the North Delta Bypass flows; and the south Delta intake diversions would be regulated by the proposed Old and Middle River flow criteria. Alternative 4H4 modified the Export/Inflow definition to include the north Delta and south Delta intakes in the Export value, and moved the Inflow location upstream of the north Delta intakes. The likely operational changes from the different computation approaches of the Export/Inflow ratio are presented through a sensitivity analysis in the Appendix 5A Section D.10.1 of the Final EIR/EIS. The sensitivity analysis results included more than the long-term average values presented in Appendix 5A Section D.10.1.</p> <p>Each of the action alternatives include a set of actions that would occur under an individual alternative as compared to the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative. Therefore, changes due to all of the actions within each alternative are considered in an integrated manner; and the effects of each individual action are not analyzed separately in this EIR/EIS.</p>
3013	20	<p>California WaterFix [CWF] project fails to analyze a Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative.</p> <p>The CWF proposed project alternatives do not have the capability of capturing surplus water during periods of high flow in the Delta (wetter months) and instead diverts more water in drier periods (months with very low outflow). None of these flawed alternatives can be considered a least environmentally damaging practicable alternative.</p> <p>DWR and Reclamation need to analyze a wider range of alternatives that include new storage upstream, in or immediately adjacent to the Delta, and south-of-the Delta, demand reduction and local water supply actions, and other potential intake locations such as the western Delta. If south Delta intakes are bad, and north Delta intakes will also harm key fish species, then other intake locations must be fully analyzed.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding alternative development. Also, see Master Responses 6 and 37 regarding demand management and additional storage, respectively.</p>
3013	21	<p>DWR's Section 404 application is unduly optimistic and misleading.</p> <p>DWR's August 24, 2015 application on page 2 states that: "The actions proposed by DWR in this permit application, which are referred to as the California WaterFix, would bring about fundamental, systemic change to the current system, putting the State on a course to "[a]chieve the two coequal goals of providing a more reliable water supply for California and protecting, restoring, and enhancing the Delta ecosystem." (California</p>	<p>The statements included in the application are consistent with the EIR/EIS purpose and need. Please refer to Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Resources, for the evaluation of Alternative 4A on fish species. Also, see response to comment 3013-14 regarding OMR flows under Alternative 4A, and Master Response 31 for information on project compliance with the Delta Reform Act.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Public Resources Code Section 29702, subd. [a])."</p> <p>This statement is incorrect and misleads decision makers and the public. The proposed project will have significant adverse impacts on key fish species and water quality in the Delta, and would fail to result in any significant increase in export water supply over existing levels. The proposed project will hinder rather than contribute to the coequal goals required by state and federal statutes (including Public Law 112-74).</p> <p>The statement in the DWR application under Ecological and Water Supply Benefits that the "proposed project would result in substantially improved conditions in the Delta for endangered and threatened species and afford greater water supply reliability for the State" is also false. The BDCP and WaterFix analysis data provided to the County by DWR shows, e.g., that reverse Old and Middle River flows would actually increase in some months and would remain significantly reversed (i.e., more negative than -2,000 cfs [cubic feet per second]) the majority of the time. The project will not minimize reverse flows despite the applicants' claims to the contrary.</p>	
3013	22	<p>DWR states that "(i)ntegration of state-of-the-art fish screens at each intake to minimize entrainment." However, the project will continue use of, and sometimes increase, export diversions from the south Delta via an unscreened Clifton Court Forebay. DWR did not disclose their intent to exceed and violate the existing USACE [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers] limits on inflows to Clifton Court Forebay. Increasing inflows to Clifton Court Forebay and leaving it unscreened is wholly inconsistent with this reference to state-of-the-art fish screens and misleads decision makers and the public.</p>	<p>Under the Proposed Project (Alternative 4A), the model assumptions maintained the existing diversion limits at Clifton Court Forebay per the USACE agreements. The export of up to 10,300 cfs of SWP water in the wetter months is based upon conveyance through the Banks Pumping Plant of water diverted at the north and south Delta intakes.</p>
3013	23	<p>The proposed project would not advance the State's water supply goals because the proposed upgrades to the SWP/CVP water conveyance system does not integrate new storage and other infrastructure that would allow the SWP and CVP to capture more water during wet periods (month) when flows in the Delta are very high and there is water available that is surplus to the needs of the Delta. The applicant makes claims about capturing more water while making no attempt to include infrastructure (storage) to store the captured water. The analysis data provided to [Contra Costa] County by DWR suggest that the project would regularly be unable to capture more water during wet months because existing south-of-Delta reservoirs would already be full.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, FEIR/EIS). Please see Master Responses 6 and 37 regarding demand management and additional storage, respectively.</p>
3013	24	<p>Contrary to DWR's misleading statement on page 3 [of their Section 404 application], implementation of the California WaterFix does not represent an important step forward in the State's efforts to resolve the longstanding conflicts within the Delta. In fact, decoupling the ecosystem restoration from the tunnels and marketing EcoRestore as "new" restoration, when almost all of the "proposed" restoration is required by the biological opinions and already long overdue, only deepens the current distrust.</p> <p>On page 2 of the Continuation Sheet for ENG FORM 4345, DWR notes that "habitat restoration is still recognized as a critical component of the State's long-term plans for the Delta." Under the California EcoRestore, the State will pursue restoration of more than 30,000 acres of fish and wildlife habitat by 2020. The USACE [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers] should request that the applicant analyze (with actual detailed model runs) and disclose the likely significant adverse cumulate impacts of the proposed project in combination with EcoRestore.</p>	<p>This comment is a general opinion about the goals and objectives of the EIR/EIS. The lead agencies believe that the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS and 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS are complete in their evaluation of impacts (using the best available science and modeling), direct and cumulative, that project description is complete and satisfies the requirements of NEPA, and that the project objectives are also precise and complete and satisfy the requirements of CEQA. The lead agencies believe 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.</p> <p>The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination,</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. For more information regarding modeling see Master Response 30.
3013	25	On page 1 of the Continuation Sheet for ENG FORM 4345, the Department of Water Resources discusses the number of alternatives that were analyzed. However, 17 of the 18 BDCP and WaterFix alternatives all involved export diversions facilities in the north Delta that would have very similar adverse impacts on key fish species no matter the subsequent alignment of the isolated canal, pipeline or tunnels, or the number of intakes. Seventeen of the 18 alternatives are essentially the same alternative. The USACE [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers] should request that the applicant consider a larger range of different alternatives, including much less environmentally damaging alternatives.	This comment is on the Section 404 application and is not on the EIR/EIS or related documents. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the range of alternatives analyzed in the EIR/EIS.
3013	26	On page 3 of the Continuation Sheet for ENG FORM 4345, the applicant discusses the Conceptual Engineering Report, Modified Pipeline/Tunnel Option - Clifton Court Forebay Pumping Plant, Volume 1, dated April 1, 2015. The applicant fails to disclose DWR's November 2009 Conceptual Engineering Report - Through-Delta Facility Conveyance Option which contains feasible examples of how the Clifton Court Forebay could be screened with state-of-the-art fish screens to significantly reduce the impacts of continued use of south Delta export facilities. The USACE [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers] should request that the applicant include new fish screens for the Clifton Court, and Jones Pumping Plant, export facilities.	This comment is on the Section 404 application and is not on the EIR/EIS or related documents.
3013	27	It is unfortunate that the official Notice (SPK-2008-00861) posted by the USACE [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers] did not include a link to the actual application submitted by DWR. The Notice merely summarized some details of the original application and, therefore, perpetuated and legitimized a number of the false claims made by the applicant. The Notice states that "(t)he applicant has stated that improvements to the conveyance system are needed to respond to increased demands and risks to water supply reliability, water quality, and the aquatic ecosystem." The proposed conveyance modification will likely improve the quality of export water delivered by the SWP and CVP to south-of-Delta contractors, but will also likely significantly degrade water quality in the Delta, which is contrary to State and federal antidegradation statutes and the 2009 Delta Reform Act. There are acute problems with the aquatic environment, water quality in the Delta, and water supply reliability that need to be addressed as soon as possible, but this flawed project proposal will harm key fish species, degrade water quality and is expected to impact the water supply of senior water right holders while barely increasing the export water supply.	This comment is on the Section 404 application and is not on the EIR/EIS or related documents.
3013	28	It is unfortunate that the official Notice (SPK-2008-00861) posted by the USACE [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers] did not include a link to the actual application submitted by DWR. The Notice merely summarized some details of the original application and, therefore, perpetuated and legitimized a number of the false claims made by the applicant. The USACE Notice states that "(t)he applicant is in the process of developing information to support the analysis of alternatives pursuant to the Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines. All	This comment is on the Section 404 application and is not on the EIR/EIS or related documents. Please see Master Responses 4 and 6 regarding alternatives development and Demand Management, respectively.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		reasonable project alternatives, in particular those which may be less damaging to the aquatic environment, will be considered." The alternatives presented in the BDCP Draft EIR/EIS and in the California WaterFix RDEIR/SDEIS involve continued use of the existing inadequately screened south Delta export intakes, increased exports and reverse flows during drier months when the Delta is most stressed, and new intakes in the north Delta directly along the migration path of key salmon and steelhead species. The new north Delta intakes were acknowledged in the November 2013 Draft BDCP Executive Summary to adversely impact key fish species. The alternatives that have been considered at this time are damaging to the aquatic environment. The USACE must request additional alternatives be developed that actually improve the aquatic environment and contribute to achieving the coequal goals be developed, e.g., alternatives that include new storage, actions to reduce water demand, and other possible locations for the new intakes to allow water to flow into and through the Delta before being diverted.	
3013	29	<p>It is unfortunate that the official Notice (SPK-2008-00861) posted by the USACE [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers] did not include a link to the actual application submitted by DWR. The Notice merely summarized some details of the original application and, therefore, perpetuated and legitimized a number of the false claims made by the applicant.</p> <p>The USACE's Notice indicates that the applicant is in the process of developing a Conceptual Mitigation Plan. The deadline for comments should at least be postponed until sometime well after this Mitigation Plan is completed and made available for public comment and review.</p>	This comment is on the Section 404 application and is not on the EIR/EIS or related documents.
3013	30	<p>It is unfortunate that the official Notice (SPK-2008-00861) posted by the USACE [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers] did not include a link to the actual application submitted by DWR. The Notice merely summarized some details of the original application and, therefore, perpetuated and legitimized a number of the false claims made by the applicant.</p> <p>The Notice states that the "decision whether to issue a permit will be based on an evaluation of the probable impacts, including cumulative impacts, of the described activity on the public interest." The WaterFix RDEIR/SDEIS is inadequate and does not support a decision by the USACE because it fails to carry out a detailed environmental analysis, with full model runs, of the cumulative impacts of the proposed project, the foreseeable habitat restoration actions under EcoRestore (which are already required through the federal biological opinions and long overdue) and future storage projects that have been studied for many years as part of the CalFed Bay-Delta program and its successors. The RDEIR/SDEIS acknowledges the adverse impacts on water quality could be significant depending upon the location of the new habitat, and new storage will change the timing and quantity of exports via the new conveyance causing additional significant adverse impacts that have not yet been analyzed or disclosed. The USACE must request that the applicant do a full cumulative analysis of the environmental impacts of these future actions.</p>	The RDEIR/SDEIS, includes in Section 5, Cumulative Impact Analyses and this Final EIR/EIS includes cumulative effects analyses in each resource chapter at a level of detail required under CEQA and NEPA. Future water management and Delta conditions, including storage and habitat restoration could potentially change Delta conditions and the effects of these future actions would require separate environmental review that would account for disclose existing Delta conditions at the time of the Notice of Preparation. If the California WaterFix were approved and operational prior to future projects, its operations would be included in the existing conditions description and would be incorporated into analyses, including modeling analyses to fully describe its effects.
3013	31	It is unfortunate that the official Notice (SPK-2008-00861) posted by the USACE [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers] did not include a link to the actual application submitted by DWR. The Notice merely summarized some details of the original application and, therefore, perpetuated and legitimized a number of the false claims made by the	This comment is on the Section 404 application and is not on the EIR/EIS or related documents.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>applicant.</p> <p>The USACE Notice states that the "decision whether to issue permission pursuant to Section 408 [typo: should be 404] will be based on an evaluation of whether the project will impair the usefulness of the project works or is injurious to the public interest. The benefits, which reasonably may be expected to accrue from the proposed alteration, must be balanced against its reasonably foreseeable detriments." The proposed project is injurious to the public interests because it will hinder rather than harm the state and federal coequal goals, will require expenditure of funds that could otherwise have been used to meet the ecosystem, water quality and water supply needs of California and the nation, and will likely result in a very expensive stranded assets (the twin tunnels and new intakes) once the SWRCB sets new increased flow requirements for the Delta.</p>	
3013	32	<p>When Contra Costa County asked the USACE [U.S. Army Corps of Engineers] for a copy of the original DWR application, or that a link be provided on the USACE website, we were asked to submit a Freedom of Information Act request. Freedom of Information Act requests involve additional paperwork and substantial delay as well as the possibility of additional financial costs for the entity requesting the material. This is not good public policy and denies the public the opportunity to fully understand and comment upon the proposed project and Section 404 application.</p>	<p>This comment is on the Section 404 application and is not on the EIR/EIS or related documents. DWR has made a copy of the Section 404 permit application available online at https://s3.amazonaws.com/californiawater/pdfs/5n2mg_Complete_Final_CA_Water_Fix_USACE_404_Permit_Application.pdf.</p>
3013	33	<p>A public hearing is needed to fully discuss the numerous problems with the California WaterFix project.</p> <p>Contra Costa County requests that a public hearing be held to consider [DWR's Section 404] application. The California WaterFix project is seriously flawed and will have significant adverse impacts on key fish populations in the Bay-Delta system. A hearing will provide concerned Delta stakeholders the opportunity to present more detailed information about the major problems with the project.</p>	<p>This comment is on the Section 404 application and is not on the EIR/EIS or related documents.</p>
3013	34	<p>There is an urgent need to address the serious problems with the Delta ecosystem. The USACE [U.S. Army Corps Engineers] should reject [DWR's Section 404] application and request a new set of alternatives and analyses that will contribute to achievement of the coequal goals.</p> <p>If the U.S. Army Corps Engineers decides against this course of action, the USACE should suspend the current deadline for comments and set a new deadline once the Conceptual Mitigation Plan, Biological Opinions, WaterFix Final EIR/EIS and related documents are completed.</p> <p>If the USACE decides against suspending the deadline for comments, the USACE should hold a public hearing to allow a full discussion of the problems and major impacts of this WaterFix project.</p>	<p>This comment is on the Section 404 application and is not on the EIR/EIS or related documents.</p>
3013	35	<p>[ATT3: RECIRC Letter #2502. Contra Costa County comments on WaterFix RDEIR/SDEIS.]</p>	<p>This 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 comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.</p>
3013	36	<p>[ATT4: RECIRC Letter #2577. U.S. EPA comments on WaterFix REDIR/SDEIS.]</p>	<p>This 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 comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3013	37	[ATT5: RECIRC Letter #2582. SWRCB comments on WaterFix RDEIR/SDEIS.]	This 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 comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
3013	38	[ATT6: Delta Independent Science Board comments on WaterFix RDEIR/SDEIS.]	This 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 comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS. For responses to comments related to the Delta Independent Science Board's letters, please refer to comment letters BDCP 1448 and/or RECIRC 2546.
3013	39	[ATT7: RECIRC Letter #2597. Contra Costa Water District comments on WaterFix RDEIR/SDEIS.]	This 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 comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
3014	1	<p>On behalf of my Tribe, the United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC), I would like for the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers to formally consider this request to be added as an invited signatory to the California Water Fix and EcoRestore Project Programmatic Agreement and any other agreement documents that result from the project. As the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO), I have approval authority for any responsibilities or duties assumed under the agreement, or authority to represent the broad interests of our Tribe organization, as the case may be. We may also defer this responsibility to Chairman Gene Whitehouse if so requested by Tribal Council. The signature page of the agreement document should identify the UAIC as an invited signatory.</p> <p>Invited signatory duties and responsibilities: "In accordance with 36 CFR § 800. 6(c)(2), an invited signatory, upon signing, has the authority to amend and terminate the agreement. The agency official may invite additional parties to sign the agreement, such as an Indian tribe or NHO who attaches religious and cultural significance to historic properties affected by the undertaking (off tribal lands), or any party that assumes a responsibility under the agreement. The refusal of an invited signatory to sign the agreement does not prevent the agreement from being executed; however, an agreement cannot impose a duty or responsibility on a party that has not signed it. When an Indian tribe or NHO is asked to be an invited signatory to an agreement for which the undertaking will not occur on or affect historic properties on tribal lands, the THPO or a representative designated by the tribe or NHO, as the case may be, can sign the agreement on behalf of the tribe or NHO. The ACHP notes and accepts that some tribes may decline to sign agreement documents in principle but may participate in development of the agreement. Such decisions are within the rights of Indian tribes, and the ACHP recommends that agencies understand and accept such decisions.</p> <p>Applicants are frequently asked to be invited signatories due to the responsibilities assigned to them under the agreement. In some instances, an agency may be able to condition the terms of its assistance or permit to an applicant as a means of compelling the applicant to take certain actions under a Section 106 agreement even if the applicant declines to sign the agreement. Federal agencies determine whether to invite additional signatories to sign the agreement and should weigh the decision carefully, since an invited signatory who actually signs an agreement has the same ability to amend or terminate the agreement as other signatories. Asking parties to be invited signatories to a Section 106 agreement can evidence a higher level of commitment to success in the agreement's implementation as well as continued engagement and</p>	<p>The lead agencies acknowledge the request to be added as a signatory to the California Water Fix and EcoRestore Project Programmatic Agreement. The lead agencies have shared these comments with the Army Corps of Engineers as they have begun a separate and parallel process to meet Corp permitting requirements.</p> <p>For more information regarding permitting please see Master Response 45.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		partnership in the process."	
3014	2	ATT 1: RECIRC letter 353	This 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 comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
3015	1	The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta therefore I strongly oppose the Delta Tunnels Plan.	DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. The project would help to address the resilience and adaptability of the Delta to climate change through water delivery facilities combined with a range of operational flexibility. Potential impacts to the environment that could occur from the construction or ongoing operation of the action alternatives are described throughout relevant resource chapter in the Final EIR/EIS. Mitigation measures are provided to help lessen these impacts to the environment.
3015	2	Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on water that should flow through the Delta, by increasing water independence locally.	The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including storm water drainage. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.
3015	3	Please stop the California Water Fix, and review more alternatives that will actually save California tax- and ratepayers billions of dollars while investing in jobs and local water sources that build longterm sustainability. Especially consider investment in groundwater storage options.	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. 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 and Master Response 37 for more information regarding why additional water storage alternatives were not considered in the EIR/EIS or RDEIR/SDEIS.
3015	4	I urge you not to permit the Delta Tunnels/California Water Fix (Alternative 4A) project to move forward.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3015	5	California doesn't need more dams - we have 1,400 already and the best spots have been built on.	Water storage is not a topic that is addressed in the EIR/EIS for the proposed project. This is because the proposed project does not propose storage as a project component. Although the physical facilities contemplated by the proposed project, once up and running would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, the proposed project is a stand-alone project for

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>purposes of CEQA and NEPA, just as future storage projects would be.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the development of alternatives and Master Response 37 regarding water storage.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.</p>
3015	6	Our water supply can be better secured in the future by investing in our depleted aquifers, which are the only things large enough to replace the long-term storage that the Sierra Nevada snowpack used to provide.	See response to comment 3015-3 regarding groundwater storage.
3015	7	Groundwater storage provides a cost-effective, locally driven method of providing both seasonal and year to year water storage.	Please see Master Response 4 regarding the development of alternatives and Master Response 37 regarding water storage.
3016	1	The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta therefore I strongly oppose the Delta Tunnels Plan.	<p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. The project would help to address the resilience and adaptability of the Delta to climate change through water delivery facilities combined with a range of operational flexibility.</p> <p>Potential impacts to the environment that could occur from the construction or ongoing operation of the action alternatives are described throughout relevant resource chapter in the Final EIR/EIS. Mitigation measures are provided to help lessen these impacts to the environment.</p>
3016	2	Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on water that should flow through the Delta, by increasing water independence locally.	<p>The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including storm water drainage. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
3016	3	Please stop the California Water Fix, and review more alternatives that will actually save California tax- and ratepayers billions of dollars while investing in jobs and local water sources that build long-term sustainability. Especially consider investment in groundwater storage options.	<p>It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>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 and Master Response 37 for more information regarding why additional water storage alternatives were not considered in the EIR/EIS or</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			RDEIR/SDEIS.
3016	4	I urge you not to permit the Delta Tunnels/California Water Fix (Alternative 4A) project to move forward.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3017	1	Water supply reliability: The Final EIR/EIS should provide additional information on water supply yield during each type of water year (normal, dry and wet) so that the water reliability benefits can be better understood and all storage assets in southern California optimized to enhance reliability during the inevitable dry periods.	The EIR/EIS addresses the changes in long-term conditions under the action alternatives (including the Proposed Project) as compared to the Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative. The changes in total exports and deliveries to all SWP and CVP water users are presented for long-term and dry/critical dry conditions in Appendix 5A, Section C, of the EIR/EIS. The changes in total exports are also presented for all water year types in tables included in Appendix 5A, Section C, of the EIR/EIS.
3017	2	Endangered Species Act permitting: The change in regulatory approach for Endangered Species Act compliance from the BDCP's Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan to a Section 7 consultation is a significant change to achieve more regulatory certainty. We strongly urge the lead agencies and the permitting agencies to incorporate adaptive management and participative governance in operational decisions into the Final EIR/EIS and supporting agreements to ensure consistent delivery of SWP supplies.	The collaborative science and adaptive management and monitoring program has been updated for this Final EIR/EIS. Please refer to the Executive Summary and Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives and Master Response 33.
3017	3	Habitat mitigation: The amount of mitigation acreage under the modified Preferred Alternative has significantly increased. There is no clear description of how the amount of acreage was determined or why it has become the responsibility of the water supply facilities. The Final EIR/EIS should provide a detailed explanation and nexus between the proposed mitigation acreage for Alternative 4A and why water suppliers and ultimately water ratepayers will shoulder those costs.	<p>The commenter suggests that the amount of habitat and mitigation related to construction of the water conveyance facilities under the modified Preferred Alternative 4A has substantially increased from the amount identified under the BDCP. The analysis for the loss of habitat and/or direct mortality of a species considers the collective loss of habitat from water conveyance construction and the Conservation Measures/Environmental Commitments. Alternatives 4 and 4A utilize the same water conveyance construction footprint but differ in that they have different levels of restoration with Alternative 4 having greater impacts to biological resources from restoration actions when compared to Alternative 4A (note some restoration actions to benefit one species or natural community result in effects on other species or land cover types). The proposed restoration under Alternative 4A is less than that proposed under Alternative 4. Alternative 4 would result in the protection of 69,275 acres and restoration 83,839 acres (see Table 12-ES-2 in the EIR/EIS) and Alternative 4A would result in the protection of up to 13,340 acres and restoration of up to 2,496 acres. The analysis in Chapter 12 of the EIR/EIS does not separately discuss the compensation acreages for water conveyance impacts and restoration impacts.</p> <p>Language to explain how the proposed protection and restoration acreages were generated has been added to Chapter 3 of the EIR/EIS in Section 3.3.2.2 Non-HCP Alternative Environmental Commitments. In summary, this new language states that the acreages for the Environmental Commitments under the non-HCP alternatives were developed by taking into consideration the analysis conducted in Appendix 12D, Feasibility Assessment of Conservation Measures Offsetting Water Conveyance Facilities Construction Impacts on Terrestrial Biological Resources for the BDCP alternatives, which used typical mitigation ratios to determine the sufficiency of the BDCP conservation strategy as CEQA and NEPA mitigation (i.e., whether the BDCP conservation strategy includes sufficient land acquisition and restoration to adequately mitigate the impacts of CM1 for purposes of CEQA and NEPA). The first step involved applying these mitigation ratios to the water conveyance facility impacts on natural communities to obtain the restoration and protection acreages necessary to offset these impacts. Once these initial natural community restoration and protection acreages were obtained, they were then compared to the mitigation requirements for species addressed in the EIR/EIS that use these natural communities as habitat. Several of the species analyzed in the EIR/EIS utilize the same general natural communities but may only use specific subsets of these natural communities or are geographically restricted to certain portions of the study area where these natural communities occur. Therefore, the total acreages of proposed natural community restoration and protection increased to account for species needs. Where restoration is anticipated to result in additional impacts on natural communities and species habitats, the restoration and protection acreages were increased further.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Through an iterative process, final acreages for natural community protection and restoration were arrived at when it was determined by project biologists that proposed restoration and protection was sufficient to offset the loss or conversion of natural communities and species habitats from water conveyance construction and proposed restoration activities.
3018	1	Water supply reliability: The Final EIR/EIS should provide additional information on water supply yield during each type of water year (normal, dry and wet) so that the water reliability benefits can be better understood and all storage assets in southern California optimized to enhance reliability during the inevitable dry periods.	The EIR/EIS addresses the changes in long-term conditions under the action alternatives (including the Proposed Project) as compared to the Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative. The changes in total exports and deliveries to all SWP and CVP water users are presented for long-term and dry/critical dry conditions in Appendix 5A, Section C, of the EIR/EIS. The changes in total exports are also presented for all water year types in tables included in Appendix 5A, Section C, of the EIR/EIS.
3018	2	Endangered Species Act permitting: The change in regulatory approach for Endangered Species Act compliance from the BDCP's Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan to a Section 7 consultation is a significant change to achieve more regulatory certainty. We strongly urge the lead agencies and the permitting agencies to incorporate adaptive management and participative governance in operational decisions into the Final EIR/EIS and supporting agreements to ensure consistent delivery of SWP supplies.	The collaborative science and adaptive management and monitoring program has been updated for this Final EIR/EIS. Please refer to the Executive Summary and Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives and Master Response 33.
3018	3	Habitat mitigation: The amount of mitigation acreage under the modified Preferred Alternative has significantly increased. There is no clear description of how the amount of acreage was determined or why it has become the responsibility of the water supply facilities. The Final EIR/EIS should provide a detailed explanation and nexus between the proposed mitigation acreage for Alternative 4A and why water suppliers and ultimately water ratepayers will shoulder those costs.	<p>The commenter suggests that the amount of habitat and mitigation related to construction of the water conveyance facilities under the modified Preferred Alternative 4A has substantially increased from the amount identified under the BDCP. The analysis for the loss of habitat and/or direct mortality of a species considers the collective loss of habitat from water conveyance construction and the Conservation Measures/Environmental Commitments. Alternatives 4 and 4A utilize the same water conveyance construction footprint but differ in that they have different levels of restoration with Alternative 4 having greater impacts to biological resources from restoration actions when compared to Alternative 4A (note some restoration actions to benefit one species or natural community result in effects on other species or land cover types). The proposed restoration under Alternative 4A is less than that proposed under Alternative 4. Alternative 4 would result in the protection of 69,275 acres and restoration 83,839 acres (see Table 12-ES-2 in the EIR/EIS) and Alternative 4A would result in the protection of up to 13,340 acres and restoration of up to 2,496 acres. The analysis in Chapter 12 of the EIR/EIS does not separately discuss the compensation acreages for water conveyance impacts and restoration impacts.</p> <p>Language to explain how the proposed protection and restoration acreages were generated has been added to Chapter 3 of the EIR/EIS in Section 3.3.2.2 Non-HCP Alternative Environmental Commitments. In summary, this new language states that the acreages for the Environmental Commitments under the non-HCP alternatives were developed by taking into consideration the analysis conducted in Appendix 12D, Feasibility Assessment of Conservation Measures Offsetting Water Conveyance Facilities Construction Impacts on Terrestrial Biological Resources for the BDCP alternatives, which used typical mitigation ratios to determine the sufficiency of the BDCP conservation strategy as CEQA and NEPA mitigation (i.e., whether the BDCP conservation strategy includes sufficient land acquisition and restoration to adequately mitigate the impacts of CM1 for purposes of CEQA and NEPA). The first step involved applying these mitigation ratios to the water conveyance facility impacts on natural communities to obtain the restoration and protection acreages necessary to offset these impacts. Once these initial natural community restoration and protection acreages were obtained, they were then compared to the mitigation requirements for species addressed in the EIR/EIS that use these natural communities as habitat. Several of the species analyzed in the EIR/EIS utilize the same general natural communities but may only use specific subsets of these natural communities or are geographically restricted to certain portions of the study area where these natural communities occur. Therefore, the total acreages of proposed natural community restoration and protection increased to account for species needs. Where restoration is anticipated to result in additional impacts on natural communities and species habitats, the restoration and protection acreages were increased further.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Through an iterative process, final acreages for natural community protection and restoration were arrived at when it was determined by project biologists that proposed restoration and protection was sufficient to offset the loss or conversion of natural communities and species habitats from water conveyance construction and proposed restoration activities.
3019	1	Water supply reliability: The Final EIR/EIS should provide additional information on water supply yield during each type of water year (normal, dry and wet) so that the water reliability benefits can be better understood and all storage assets in southern California optimized to enhance reliability during the inevitable dry periods.	The EIR/EIS addresses the changes in long-term conditions under the action alternatives (including the Proposed Project) as compared to the Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative. The changes in total exports and deliveries to all SWP and CVP water users are presented for long-term and dry/critical dry conditions in Appendix 5A, Section C, of the EIR/EIS. The changes in total exports are also presented for all water year types in tables included in Appendix 5A, Section C, of the EIR/EIS.
3019	2	Endangered Species Act permitting: The change in regulatory approach for Endangered Species Act compliance from the BDCP's Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan to a Section 7 consultation is a significant change to achieve more regulatory certainty. We strongly urge the lead agencies and the permitting agencies to incorporate adaptive management and participative governance in operational decisions into the Final EIR/EIS and supporting agreements to ensure consistent delivery of SWP supplies.	The collaborative science and adaptive management and monitoring program has been updated for this Final EIR/EIS. Please refer to the Executive Summary and Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives and Master Response 33.
3019	3	Habitat mitigation: The amount of mitigation acreage under the modified Preferred Alternative has significantly increased. There is no clear description of how the amount of acreage was determined or why it has become the responsibility of the water supply facilities. The Final EIR/EIS should provide a detailed explanation and nexus between the proposed mitigation acreage for Alternative 4A and why water suppliers and ultimately water ratepayers will shoulder those costs.	<p>The commenter suggests that the amount of habitat and mitigation related to construction of the water conveyance facilities under the modified Preferred Alternative 4A has substantially increased from the amount identified under the BDCP. The analysis for the loss of habitat and/or direct mortality of a species considers the collective loss of habitat from water conveyance construction and the Conservation Measures/Environmental Commitments. Alternatives 4 and 4A utilize the same water conveyance construction footprint but differ in that they have different levels of restoration with Alternative 4 having greater impacts to biological resources from restoration actions when compared to Alternative 4A (note some restoration actions to benefit one species or natural community result in effects on other species or land cover types). The proposed restoration under Alternative 4A is less than that proposed under Alternative 4. Alternative 4 would result in the protection of 69,275 acres and restoration 83,839 acres (see Table 12-ES-2 in the EIR/EIS) and Alternative 4A would result in the protection of up to 13,340 acres and restoration of up to 2,496 acres. The analysis in Chapter 12 of the EIR/EIS does not separately discuss the compensation acreages for water conveyance impacts and restoration impacts.</p> <p>Language to explain how the proposed protection and restoration acreages were generated has been added to Chapter 3 of the EIR/EIS in Section 3.3.2.2 Non-HCP Alternative Environmental Commitments. In summary, this new language states that the acreages for the Environmental Commitments under the non-HCP alternatives were developed by taking into consideration the analysis conducted in Appendix 12D, Feasibility Assessment of Conservation Measures Offsetting Water Conveyance Facilities Construction Impacts on Terrestrial Biological Resources for the BDCP alternatives, which used typical mitigation ratios to determine the sufficiency of the BDCP conservation strategy as CEQA and NEPA mitigation (i.e., whether the BDCP conservation strategy includes sufficient land acquisition and restoration to adequately mitigate the impacts of CM1 for purposes of CEQA and NEPA). The first step involved applying these mitigation ratios to the water conveyance facility impacts on natural communities to obtain the restoration and protection acreages necessary to offset these impacts. Once these initial natural community restoration and protection acreages were obtained, they were then compared to the mitigation requirements for species addressed in the EIR/EIS that use these natural communities as habitat. Several of the species analyzed in the EIR/EIS utilize the same general natural communities but may only use specific subsets of these natural communities or are geographically restricted to certain portions of the study area where these natural communities occur. Therefore, the total acreages of proposed natural community restoration and protection increased to account for species needs. Where restoration is anticipated to result in additional impacts on natural communities and species habitats, the restoration and protection acreages were increased further.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Through an iterative process, final acreages for natural community protection and restoration were arrived at when it was determined by project biologists that proposed restoration and protection was sufficient to offset the loss or conversion of natural communities and species habitats from water conveyance construction and proposed restoration activities.
3020	1	Recommend partnering through a statewide agreement to engage tribes in an effort to comply with CA FGC 16000 and CA GC 11019.8, with the Pacific Region, Bureau of Indian Affairs.	<p>Issues raised by the commenter address the merits and implementation of the project and do not raise any specific issues related to the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 21 regarding tribal issues. Additionally, Chapter 18, Cultural Resources, describes the coordination efforts made through the release of the RDEIR/SDEIS.</p>
3021	1	<p>We have reviewed your EIR for the BDCP/California Water Fix Project, which describes multiple alternatives for the BDCP and identifies potential hazardous waste sites. The EIR also mentions the expansion of Clifton Court Forebay, but does not include specific details for the expansion.</p> <p>Clifton Court Forebay Dam, No. 164 is currently under State jurisdiction for dam safety. An enlargement application, together with plans, specifications and the appropriate filing fee must be filed with the Division of Safety of Dam for this work. All dam safety related issues must be resolved prior to approval of the application, and the work must be performed under the direction of a Civil Engineer registered in California. Sharon Tapia, our Design Engineering Branch Chief, is responsible for the application process and can be reached at (916) 227-4660.</p>	<p>Comment indicates that the State Department of Dam Safety has jurisdiction over Clifton Court Forebay regarding dam safety. DWR will coordinate for all regulatory approvals at the proper time.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
3022	1	<p>Unfortunately, the Administration has ignored every suggestion offered by Butte County and appears intent to move forward with the California WaterFix (BDCP/WaterFix) and California EcoRestore with little regard to legal requirements or mitigating impacts. Butte County's list of concerns with the BDCP/WaterFix is more than legal technicalities; if ignored the failures would lead to actions that will ultimately damage the region's economy, environment and communities. Therefore, the Butte County Board of Supervisors remains opposed to the BDCP/WaterFix.</p> <p>The northern Sacramento Valley region is neither a party to, nor a direct beneficiary of, the BDCP/WaterFix. However, contrary to state and federal commitments, implementation of BDCP/WaterFix will redirect impacts and impose obligations on communities, water users and the environment in the northern Sacramento Valley. Although Butte County holds little faith that the Administration will modify the BDCP/WaterFix to address legitimate concerns, it is compelled to point out the shortcomings. The BDCP/WaterFix ignores fundamental state water policies, disregards area of origin water rights, violates the water right priority system and redirects impacts to the northern Sacramento Valley without fully assessing or mitigating those impacts. The 2013 EIR/EIS revisions included very little changes from the BDCP EIR/EIS. Therefore, most of the comment references are to the BDCP EIR/EIS document.</p>	<p>In the State of California, all water belongs to the people of the state; and water rights are issued as rights to use the water for reasonable and beneficial uses. The proposed project would not affect upstream water rights. It aims to allow the SWP and CVP to deliver more reliable water supplies, in a way that is less harmful to fish. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. The CALSIM II modeling performed for conveyance facility operations takes into account projected future demand for water supply in areas upstream of the Delta (as part of the future No Action baseline) prior to calculating Proposed Project diversion estimates to ensure that no area-of-origin protections or upstream water rights are affected by project conveyance facilities. Please see Appendix 5A of the Final EIR/EIS for additional modeling details.</p> <p>Nothing in the proposed project would change current regulatory requirements that protect the beneficial use of water. When exporting water from the Delta, DWR and Reclamation must comply with all current state and federal regulatory requirements in effect at the time of the export pumping, including numerous environmental standards, laws, and regulations relating to Delta inflow and outflow, Delta water quality, fish protection, environmental needs, water rights, and the needs of other users. For more information on beneficial use of water please see Master Response 34.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 32 for detailed information on water rights issues. Area of origin is also discussed in Master Response 26. For a discussion of the Public Trust Doctrine please see Master Response 13.</p> <p>Information on the project's purpose and need can be found in Master Response 3 and Chapter 2 of the Final EIR/EIS.</p>
3022	2	One of California's fundamental water policies mandates that "each region that depends on water from the Delta watershed shall improve its regional self-reliance for water through investment in water use efficiency, water recycling, advanced water	The 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS stated that analysts considered whether the 2013 DEIR/DEIS cumulative impact analysis needed to be revised to reflect any reasonable and foreseeable actions by GSAs. The timetable for implementing the SGMA specifies that local GSAs must be identified by 2017, and that overdrafted basins

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		technologies, local and regional water supply projects, and improved regional coordination of local and regional water supply efforts" (Water Code, § 85021). Additionally, the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act of 2014 (SGMA) emphasizes the principle of regional self-reliance by requiring local agencies enact long-term plans to sustain their groundwater basins. Most of the beneficiaries of the BDCP/WaterFix are in basins subject to SGMA and the policy of regional self-reliance. SGMA went into effect six months before the release of the BDCP/WaterFix documents. The Supplemental EIR/EIS stated that cumulative impacts from implementation of SGMA by various groundwater sustainability agencies were reviewed and found not to be substantive. The SGMA review lacked documentation or data.	must be covered by groundwater sustainability plans by 2020 (http://groundwater.ca.gov/moresgma.cfm). It is improbable that any future actions could be foreseeable before those plans are in place. The level of detail presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS is adequate to inform the CEQA/NEPA decisions. Information on the project's purpose and need can be found in Master Response 3 and Chapter 2 of the Final EIR/EIS.
3022	3	The BDCP/WaterFix will jeopardize the regional self-reliance of the northern Sacramento Valley. The health, vitality and sustainability of northern Sacramento Valley depends upon the exercise of water rights and honoring area-of-origin rights. The Legislature expressly recognized that water rights and area-of-origin rights shall not be impaired or diminished as a result of any program or project in the Bay-Delta (Water Code, § 85031). Specifically, the BDCP/WaterFix calls for extracting more water from the northern Sacramento Valley. The BDCP/WaterFix will deplete and, in some instances, draw down upstream reservoirs to dead pool conditions. The result would create conditions that prevent other water users from obtaining supplies that they are entitled to under contract or water rights. In doing so, the BDCP/WaterFix will violate long-standing principles of California water law by causing upstream senior diverters to forego diversions, thereby allowing the continued export of water by junior appropriators. The approach to subvert the area-of-origin statutes is a clear violation of those statutes intended to protect areas of origin, including the protection of northern Sacramento Valley water supplies from injury by export projects.	Please see response to comment 3022-1. For information on upstream reservoir effects, please see Master Response 25.
3022	4	A more direct impact from the BDCP/WaterFix comes from the disclosure that there is an expected increase in groundwater use in the Sacramento Valley to make up for any shortfalls in surface water supply of Central Valley Project (CVP) contractors. The EIR/EIS discusses the potential for the BDCP to result in "minor decreases in water supply availability to CVP water users in the Sacramento Valley "(See Analysis of Groundwater Conditions in Areas that Use SWP/CVP Water Supplies, EIR/EIS, p. 7-32, lines 30-40). The estimated decrease in supply is 50,000 acre feet/ year. The section concludes, "[a] 2% increase in groundwater use in the Sacramento Valley to make up for any shortfalls in surface water supply is not anticipated to substantially impact the groundwater resources as long as the additional pumping is not concentrated in a particular area of the valley". No information is provided as to where additional pumping will take place, whether it will interfere with existing water supplies, or whether it will exacerbate existing groundwater overdraft or cause groundwater overdraft in locations where that condition does not presently exist. Despite the acknowledgement that the BDCP/WaterFix would affect Sacramento Valley groundwater, analysis of the impact to the region's groundwater was specifically eliminated. In the EIR/EIS, Chapter 7, Groundwater states that for the "purposes of this analysis, the groundwater study area (the area in which impacts may occur) consists of the Delta Region... the Upstream of the Delta Region and..." On page 7-13 the description of the Sacramento Valley points out that portions of the region are showing early signs of declining groundwater elevations. On page 7-37 the EIR/EIS states, "The Central Valley Hydrologic Model domain was reduced by eliminating most of the Sacramento Valley and San Joaquin Valley from the domain when developing Central	The proposed project (Alternative 4A) and other action alternatives would not change operational criteria for the SWP and CVP reservoirs in the Sacramento Valley; and would only export water allocated to the SWP and CVP under existing water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board. Water deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in the Sacramento Valley would be similar under all action alternatives and the No Action Alternative, as shown in Appendix 5A, Section C, of the Final EIR/EIS. Long-term water deliveries to SWP water users in the Sacramento Valley would be similar under all action alternatives and Existing Conditions. There would be increased water deliveries (177,000 acre-feet long-term average) to CVP municipal and industrial water users in the Sacramento Valley under all action alternatives and No Action Alternative as compared to Existing Conditions due to growth projected under existing general plans and urban water management plans. This increase in water deliveries to CVP municipal and industrial water users in the Sacramento Valley result in a decrease in water deliveries to CVP agricultural water users in the Sacramento Valley under all action alternatives and No Action Alternative as compared to Existing Conditions. Due to the reduction in CVP agricultural water deliveries, water users could increase groundwater use. These changes would occur with or without implementation of the project. Therefore, changes in groundwater in the Sacramento Valley were only associated with increased groundwater use for CVP agricultural water users that would occur with or without the project. Therefore, the EIR/EIS did not analyze changes in the Sacramento Valley under the action alternatives as compared to the Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative. For more information on groundwater please see Chapter 7 of the Final EIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Valley Hydrologic Model -D. This modification allowed for greater precision in model output in the Delta Region." The decision to eliminate the Sacramento Valley from hydrologic modeling demonstrates the disregard of the region and creates an inconsistency within the EIR/EIS. The sensitivity of groundwater basins in the region necessitates that the BDCP/WaterFix fully disclose and assess groundwater impacts upstream of the Delta.	
3022	5	Another blatant attempt of the BDCP/WaterFix to redirect impacts comes from the goal of facilitating groundwater substitution transfer programs. The EIR/EIS Section 5C.10 Potential Sources of Upstream-of-Delta Water Transfers and Potential Impact indicates that the BDCP is expecting additional water from upstream of the Delta. The EIR/EIS ignored any environmental consequence from groundwater substitution programs and failed to acknowledge that groundwater substitution programs must comply with applicable County ordinances. In Butte County, groundwater substitution transfer programs are governed by the Groundwater Conservation Ordinance (Chapter 33 of the Butte County Code). The BDCP/WaterFix must fully disclose, assess and mitigate the impacts of the plans to incorporate north of Delta groundwater basins into the state water project.	As described in Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives, of the Final EIR/EIS, the proposed action and other action alternatives considered in the EIR/EIS do not include specific water transfers. The EIR/EIS acknowledges that water transfers would continue in a similar manner as historic transfers and in accordance with State and Federal laws and regulations. The EIR/EIS also acknowledges that the use of water transfers between agencies could increase in the future as SWP, CVP, and other surface water supplies are reduced due to climate change, sea level rise, and increased water demand in the Delta watershed, as described in Appendix 1E, Water Transfers in California: Types, Recent History, and General Regulatory Setting, and Appendix 5D, Water Transfer Analysis Methodology and Results, of the EIR/EIS. Because specific agreements have not been identified for water transfers and other non-project voluntary water market transactions, project level analysis of impacts upstream of the Delta is highly speculative and this EIR/EIS does not constitute the CEQA/NEPA coverage required for any specific transaction. Rather, it provides an analysis of how transfers relate to the conveyance facilities. As indicated in Appendix 5D, the analyses are conservative because it is not known if adequate water would be available from other water users for transfer. As shown in Table 5D-8, the maximum cross-Delta transfers under the action alternatives would be greatest under Alternative 8 because there would be the most available capacity. Any future water transfers will require separate approvals. The analysis of any potential impacts due to water transfers are not a part of this EIR/EIS and must be covered pursuant to separate laws and regulations once the specific transfer has been proposed. Information on water transfers can also be found in Master Response 43.
3022	6	The BDCP/WaterFix should not expect additional water from the northern Sacramento Valley, it must consider that some of the water supplies currently being exported may not be available in the future due to increased demand in the areas in which the water currently being exported originates. California law expressly recognizes the prior right of communities in those areas to water currently being exported, to the extent that water will be needed to adequately supply the beneficial needs of those areas (Water Code, §§ 10505, 10505.5, 11460, 11463 and 11128; also id., §§ 12200-12220). That demand for water and the need to sustain groundwater basins, as required through the implementation of the SOMA, will increase in the Delta and north as population grows. The likelihood that less water will be available for export uses is reasonably foreseeable but not evaluated in the EIR/EIS. Again, the failure of the BDCP/WaterFix to follow the principle of regional self-reliance created irreparable flaws.	The proposed project (Alternative 4A) and other action alternatives would only export water allocated to the SWP and CVP under existing water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board. The proposed project or the action alternatives do not include provisions for water transfers (please see response to 3022-5) or conveyance of groundwater. The analysis of any potential impacts due to water transfers are not a part of this EIR/EIS and must be covered pursuant to separate laws and regulations once the specific transfer has been proposed. For more information on water rights, please see Master Response 32. Regarding water transfers please see response to comment 3022-5. Information on the project's purpose and need can be found in Master Response 3 and Chapter 2 of the Final EIR/EIS.
3022	7	The BDCP/WaterFix and the EIR/EIS fail to fully describe the project's socioeconomic impacts. Without explanation, the EIR/EIS limits the analysis of socioeconomic impacts to Delta counties (Sacramento, San Joaquin, Yolo, Solano, and Contra Costa Counties). However, as noted elsewhere in the EIR/EIS, the BDCP/WaterFix impacts a much larger area, for example, the operational changes to Lake Oroville that are acknowledged in the BDCP/WaterFix. Appendix 5.C (page 5C 1.1) of the BDCP document states that "No substantial changes in reservoir operations are expected as a result of the BDCP, with the potential exception of Lake Oroville, where the BDCP could shift substantial releases from summer months to spring months under high outflow scenario to contribute to spring outflow criteria". Actions through the BDCP/WaterFix would further erode the	The proposed project (Alternative 4A) and other action alternatives would not change operational criteria for the SWP and CVP reservoirs in the Sacramento Valley. Under Alternative 4A (ELT), long-term average end of September Lake Oroville storage as compared to No Action Alternative (ELT) would increase. The range of incremental changes in Lake Oroville storage under Alternative 4A (LLT) compared to the No Action Alternative (LLT) are expected to remain similar to the changes observed under Alternative 4A (ELT) compared to the No Action Alternative (ELT), as the LLT only differs from ELT by climate change and sea level rise effects. Under Alternative 4A, long-term average end of September Lake Oroville storage as compared to Existing

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		region's economic, recreation and ecosystem benefit. The socioeconomic impacts analysis is inadequate because it fails to analyze the entire affected environmental setting of the proposed project and alternatives. The BDCP document, Chapter 1 (page 1-21) states, "Because the SWP and CVP water infrastructure is operated as an integrated system, the effects of implementing the BDCP may extend to aquatic systems beyond the Delta, both upstream and downstream, and will implicate water operations parameters as well as species and their habitats located in those areas. As such, the BDCP effects analysis (Chapter 5, Effects Analysis) takes into account these upstream and downstream aquatic effects, both positive and negative, and describes, analyzes, and addresses the overall effects of the BDCP. Areas potentially affected by the implementation of the BDCP located outside of the Plan Area, have been included in the analysis of effects to ensure that all of the potential effects within the action area (all areas to be affected directly or indirectly by the federal action and not merely the immediate area involved in the action), as defined by Section 7 of the ESA, have been adequately assessed." Although the BDCP makes this statement, the EIS/EIR failed to assess the direct and indirect impacts from the BDCP outside of the Delta. This failure to assess the impacts of the BDCP to the region north of the Delta is inconsistent with State and Federal law.	<p>Conditions would decrease in all years. This decrease would occur due to sea level rise, climate change, and increased north of Delta demands. A comparison with storages under the No Action Alternative provides an indication of the potential change due to Alternative 4A and the results show that long-term average end of September Lake Oroville storage could increase under Alternative 4A as compared to the conditions without the project. See Chapter 5, Water Supply, of this Final EIR/EIS, for more information on changes in SWP and CVP reservoir storage. For information on upstream reservoir effects, please see Master Response 25.</p> <p>Action alternatives are not anticipated to cause changes in water deliveries in areas upstream of the Delta. Therefore, Socioeconomic discussion focuses on effects occurring in the Delta region. See Section 16.3.1, of this Final EIR/EIS, for more information on the methods used for Socioeconomic analysis.</p> <p>For information regarding BDCP Effects Analysis see Master Response 5.</p> <p>For information on recreation please see Chapter 15 of the Final EIR/EIS.</p>
3022	8	Most, if not all, of the identified funding sources are speculative and are undefined; the state water contractors is among the most uncertain. The BDCP/WaterFix claims that state water contractors have committed to providing funds for the construction and operation of new water facilities, as well as for mitigation necessary to address impacts to terrestrial and aquatic impacts associated with construction and operation. The state water project contractors vary in their interest in and benefit from the BDCP/WaterFix. For example, Butte County is a state water project contractor that would derive no benefit from the BDCP/WaterFix and has gone on record opposing any financial obligation. To date, the state water contractors have yet to reach agreement on the structure of the commitment to fund BDCP/WaterFix. In fact, the state water project contractors have begun the early stages of negotiations on how the financial commitment for the BDCP/WaterFix will be structured. Additionally, the assumptions that other funding sources (e.g., federal government, state bond funds) would provide funding commitments for BDCP/WaterFix cannot be substantiated.	Please see Master Response 5 for information on project funding. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3022	9	The BDCP/WaterFix and its related EIR/EIS do not comply with State water law and inadequately assess the environmental and socioeconomic impacts. The actions of the BDCP/WaterFix would damage the region's economy, environment and communities. For these reasons, the Butte County Board of Supervisors remains opposed to the BDCP/WaterFix. The state and federal agencies are assuming enormous liability for the harm that the BDCP/WaterFix will cause. Butte County will consider taking appropriate measures to protect the County's economy, environment and communities.	<p>The Federal and State Lead Agencies have done their best to make the EIR/EIS for the project as fair, objective, and complete as possible. The Lead Agencies are following the appropriate legal process and are complying with CEQA and NEPA in preparing the EIR/EIS for the proposed project.</p> <p>Please see response to comment 3022-1 for information regarding water rights.</p>
3023	1	Inefficiencies in the system are reducing water supplies for our homes, farms and businesses. We must update this aging system to protect water supplies for our state.	This comment is consistent with the fundamental purpose of the project to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta, and water supplies of the SWP and CVP for users located south of the Delta, as described in Section 2.3 of Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need, of the EIR/EIS. 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.
3024	1	All of my concerns have to do with the issues brought forth by the prestigious National Academy of Sciences report of four years ago. Their comprehensive analysis of the twin tunnels plan was spot on, yet was ignored by those we entrust to make sound scientific	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		and fiscal decisions. The Twin Tunnel plan is one of the most expensive public works projects ever proposed. There has never been a full cost benefit analysis on this project. It is fiscally irresponsible.	index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Refer to Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
3024	2	There are no benefits for Northern California, while Southern California reaps all of the benefits, especially private interest agriculture which uses 70% of the exported water to grow nuts which are primarily exported. The Delta has over 500,000 acres of federally designated prime farm land. Many of the farms have been family owned and operated for over 150 years. It defies common sense to seize 300 Delta farms and properties by eminent domain to irrigate toxic desert soil found in the southern San Joaquin Valley.	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 does not seek any new water rights nor include any regulatory actions that would affect water rights holders other than DWR, Reclamation, and SWP and CVP contractors. 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.
3024	3	No one has addressed how the drinking water supply of Delta residents will be affected. Likewise, we don't know what damage salt water intrusion will have upon the aquifers and wells used by Delta residents. The diversion of water at the proposed sites steals the freshest water before it reaches the Delta. In addition, the Contra Costa County Water District stated that BDCP failed to model for potential increases of carcinogens and formation of other byproducts that would cause cancer or other serious health effects. How will we mitigate the additional costs of treating the contaminated water that is left in the Delta? How can you undo the potential damage and unknown construction impact?	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. 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. Please see Master Response 5 related to the status of the BDCP and Master Response 8 related to analysis of Alternative 4A. Please see Master Response 2 regarding applying a project-level analysis for CM1 and a program-level analysis for the remaining Conservation Measures for the action alternatives. 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.
3024	4	We need to spend money on a permanent fix that doesn't continue to depend on rain water falling up north and snow pack in the mountains, such as, desalination facilities.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
3025	1	All of my concerns have to do with the issues brought forth by the prestigious National Academy of Sciences report of four years ago. Their comprehensive analysis of the twin tunnels plan was spot on, yet was ignored by those we entrust to make sound scientific and fiscal decisions. The Twin Tunnel plan is one of the most expensive public works projects ever proposed. There has never been a full cost benefit analysis on this project. It is fiscally irresponsible.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Refer to Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
3025	2	There are no benefits for Northern California, while Southern California reaps all of the benefits, especially private interest agriculture which uses 70% of the exported water to grow nuts which are primarily exported. The Delta has over 500,000 acres of federally designated prime farm land. Many of the	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
		farms have been family owned and operated for over 150 years. It defies common sense to seize 300 Delta farms and properties by eminent domain to irrigate toxic desert soil found in the southern San Joaquin Valley.	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 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation) and Chapter 14 (Agriculture) of the Final EIR/EIS for information on mitigation for impacts of the proposed project on agricultural lands in the Delta.
3025	3	No one has addressed how the drinking water supply of Delta residents will be affected. Likewise, we don't know what damage salt water intrusion will have upon the aquifers and wells used by Delta residents. The diversion of water at the proposed sites steals the freshest water before it reaches the Delta. In addition, the Contra Costa County Water District stated that BDCP failed to model for potential increases of carcinogens and formation of other byproducts that would cause cancer or other serious health effects. How will we mitigate the additional costs of treating the contaminated water that is left in the Delta? How can you undo the potential damage and unknown construction impact?	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. 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. Please see Master Response 5 related to the status of the BDCP and Master Response 8 related to analysis of Alternative 4A. Please see Master Response 2 regarding applying a project-level analysis for CM1 and a program-level analysis for the remaining Conservation Measures for the action alternatives. 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.
3025	4	We need to spend money on a permanent fix that doesn't continue to depend on rain water falling up north and snow pack in the mountains, such as, desalination facilities.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
3027	1	The tunnels won't produce more water or ensure more reliable supplies. Big agriculture and Southern CA water interests are behind this. The plan should be scuttled.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of 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. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).
3028	1	I am an avid boater and have enjoyed the Delta for the past 15 or so years. I urge you	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many 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
		not to put the tunnels in the Delta area.	<p>Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).</p>
3029	1	<p>I strongly oppose the Delta Tunnels Plan.</p> <p>Huge infrastructure investments are not the way to guarantee future water security.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p>
3029	2	<p>Small, local, appropriate conservation measures, greywater re-use, rainwater capture and storage, groundwater storage in underground aquifers, are the solutions we need to fund for true future sustainable water supplies.</p> <p>Australia got through their drought by supporting these localized interventions. In their case big desalination was not the answer, rather a boondoggle.</p>	<p>The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage.</p>
3029	3	<p>The tunnels will not create more water, they will just take water away from where it is already going, i.e. to the Bay/Delta ecosystems.</p> <p>Already powerful interests have pressured regulators into reducing required flows through the Delta, with negative impacts on many many species.</p> <p>I have a great love for the amazing sturgeon species who already struggle to survive in our Bay and Delta.</p> <p>The tunnels will most likely bring about their final demise. We have no right to extirpate a 260 million year old ancestor species!</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>
3029	4	<p>If the tunnels were to be built they would provide a monetary argument for forcing the delisting of northern California rivers from their Wild and Scenic protection status in order to actually put more water into the tunnels. This is a dangerous and alarming domino effect--better to prevent the tunnels from being built in the first place.</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>Delisting the Wild and Scenic protections status of California rivers and raising of the Shasta Dam are outside the scope of the proposed project.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Raising Shasta Dam is also a completely inappropriate use of public money as the current dam itself rarely fills to capacity. This also would point to covert plans to steal water from protected northern rivers.	
3029	5	Please oppose Alternative 4A and the Delta Tunnels proposal. Use that 15 billion dollars to invest in local jobs and local water sources that will create true water sustainability.	Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.
3030	1	This BDCP/WaterFix and its related EIR/EIS do not comply with State water law and inadequately assess the environmental and socioeconomic impacts.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of 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 respectfully disagree with the commenter's statement that the EIR/EIS does not comply with California water law and that the assessment of environmental and socioeconomic impacts is inadequate. The lead agencies believe that the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS and 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS are complete in their evaluation of impacts, direct and cumulative, and satisfy the requirements of NEPA and CEQA. The commenter does not offer any evidence on how the environmental and socioeconomic impact analysis is insufficient; therefore a more specific response cannot be provided.
3030	2	The state and federal agencies are assuming enormous liability for the harm that the BDCP/WaterFix will cause.	This comment is an opinion on the liability of the BDCP/California WaterFix. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
3030	3	Much of southern California is naturally a desert. People, businesses, including agriculture, should live within their region's hydrologic means. I urge you and the Governor to work with the citizens of this state to develop environmentally sustainable practices to meet, and or decrease, our needs for water in California.	Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. 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, Water Demand Management, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including storm water drainage. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.
3031	1	I live in the Sacramento River watershed, and have my whole life. I am extremely opposed to the Delta Tunnels and think it is one of the worst ideas our elected official(s) have come up with, ever. Our homes, businesses, farms, and wild life and lands depend on healthy water for so many things. The tunnels will have such a negative impact on so many people and wildlife, it boggles the mind. If they're built, by the time everyone realizes the damage that has been caused, it will be too late. Do not allow these tunnels to happen!	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The Lead Agencies discuss community character in Chapter 16 of the EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			(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.
3031	2	There are other options, including desalinization, recycling, conservation, rainwater catchment and storage. There is also stopping the idiocy of farming in the central part of the state. Yes, the system we have been using to allocate and move water is broken and illogical, but the tunnels are not a good solution!	<p>The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of alternative water supply augmentation approaches and does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the range of alternatives selected.</p> <p>The alternatives included in the Draft EIR/EIS represent a legally adequate reasonable range of alternatives and the scope of the analysis of alternatives fully complies with both CEQA and NEPA. The Lead Agencies carefully considered all potential alternatives that were proposed during the scoping process and during time of preparation of the Draft EIR/EIS.</p>
3031	3	I have sat back and watched as California's politicians have done a lot of objectionable stuff, but I refuse to sit back and let something like this go through. I will do whatever I can to block these tunnels from happening and I know many people that feel the same way. No twin tunnels!	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.
3032	1	I am appalled that he BDCP/WaterFix and its related EIR/EIS do not comply with State water law and inadequately assess the environmental and socioeconomic impacts.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The lead agencies respectfully disagree with the commenter's statement that the EIR/EIS does not comply with California water law and that the assessment of environmental and socioeconomic impacts is inadequate. The lead agencies believe that the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS and 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS are complete in their evaluation of impacts, direct and cumulative, and satisfy the requirements of NEPA and CEQA. The commenter does not offer any evidence on how the environmental and socioeconomic impact analysis is insufficient; therefore a more specific response cannot be provided.</p>
3032	2	The actions of the BDCP/WaterFix would damage the region's economy, environment and living conditions for my community and farmers. Fresh, clean, water supports the Delta, the largest nursery for California fisheries, the largest Pacific Coast fly over stop for migrating waterfowl, more than 500,000 acres of California prime farmland, and an urban community that is home to over 4 million people.	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The Lead Agencies discuss community character in Chapter 16 of the EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A (Socioeconomics) identifies the unique features of the Delta and describes the potential effects on Delta communities. Please see chapter 15 for a discussion on impacts to recreation. Impacts to agriculture are identified and discussed in Chapter 14; project proponents have proposed measures that would support and protect agricultural production in the Delta by securing agricultural easements and/or by seeking opportunities to protect and enhance agriculture with a focus on maintaining economic activity on agricultural lands. Please see Master Response 18 for more information on agricultural mitigation.</p>
3032	3	Stockton and San Joaquin County's primary industries are agriculture, transportation, Port of Stockton operations, and construction, and all these industries are tied to	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		sufficient Delta water quality and quantity.	
3032	4	Please stop this destructive plan that will cause nothing but problems for the State of California.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3033	1	I'm a senior citizen now, but when I first voted for Gov. Brown I was a young woman. I voted for him again 4 years ago because I thought he'd be really good when it came to protecting the environment and he has been, except for this one issue. Gov. Brown: this is not the way to solve our water problems. Don't sacrifice one of our last intact California watersheds to the San Joaquin desert "farmers." Do you want to be remembered as the governor who destroyed the Sacramento River watershed?	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3034	1	All of California depends on the water that flows from the headwaters of California through the Sacramento River Valley.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of 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.
3035	1	I live in the Sacramento River watershed and strongly oppose the California Water Fix [graft, greed, corruption Water theft Fix], the Governor's [and Kern County's] latest plan to drain the vitality from the North State.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3035	2	I am worried that the Proposed Sites Reservoir is part of a new and larger scheme by Metropolitan Water District of Los Angeles and of Westlands Water District [Southern California, etc.] to take control of our Northern California Water [acting in conjunction with the proposed Twin Tunnels Project. I am worried that these projects will become the modern version of the rape [and desecration] Of Owens Valley by Metropolitan Water District of Los Angeles; in about 1908, the Los Angeles Aqueduct effectively eliminated the Owens Valley as a viable farming community and eventually devastated the Owens Lake ecosystem. I am skeptical, but am willing to further discuss [and learn about] the Proposed Sites Reservoir Project. Hopefully, we can obtain improved legislation to protect our Northern California Water Rights.	Additional water storage was eliminated from consideration in the Draft EIR/S 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 refer to Master Response 37 (Storage) for additional information.
3035	3	The BDCP/Water Fix and its related EIR/EIS, do not comply with State water law and inadequately assess the environmental and socioeconomic impacts. The actions of the Water Fix would damage the region's economy, environment and communities. For these reasons, the Butte County Board of Supervisors remains opposed to the Water Fix. The state and federal agencies are assuming enormous liability for the harm that the Water Fix will cause. Butte County will consider taking appropriate measures to protect the County's economy, environment and communities.	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. It should be recognized that CEQA does not require the analysis of socioeconomic effects unless there is a nexus to adverse effects to the physical environment. However, since this is a joint CEQA and NEPA document, and NEPA has different direction related to socioeconomics, there was a robust discussion on socioeconomics. The EIR/S plus the associated appendices were prepared to inform the decisionmakers and

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			the public of the effects. Temporary and permanent effects to agriculture were discussed in Chapter 14 and socioeconomic effects were addressed in Chapter 16. As noted in the Executive Summary Table ES-9. Summary of BDCP/California WaterFix RDEIR/SDEIS Impacts and Mitigation Measures, there were some significant effects (CEQA) and Adverse (NEPA) associated with various alternatives. There were no significant socioeconomic effects associated with CEQA; however, some adverse effects were noted under the NEPA analysis. For example, although Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A would require much less conversion of agricultural land to restored or protected habitat than the alternatives that include a HCP/NCCP, agricultural land will still be affected by implementing any of the alternatives (ES.1.13). Similarly, Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A would have lesser socioeconomic effects associated with agricultural land conversions compared with other BDCP alternatives.
3035	4	Gov. Brown [supported by Kern County Water Agency] has proposed massive underground water export tunnels for the Delta, now inaccurately named the "California Water Fix." It is essentially the same project as the peripheral canal, which California voters rejected in 1982 by a 62.7% majority. The tunnels could grab the Sacramento River, which is the main supply of fresh water in the Delta, San Joaquin County, and the entire San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary. Fresh, clean, water supports the Delta, the largest nursery for California fisheries, the largest Pacific Coast fly over stop for migrating waterfowl, more than 500,000 acres of California prime farmland, and an urban community that is home to over 4 million people.	A number of important improvements have been made to set the current proposal apart from the Peripheral Canal. For instance, tunnels are proposed to reduce surface impacts associated with canals. The capacity of the Proposed Project is more than 10,000 cfs smaller than the Peripheral Canal. The project as proposed allows for dual conveyance allowing through-Delta operations to continue in order to maintain in-Delta water quality. The Proposed Project would require operation of the proposed new in-Delta portions of the CVP and SWP pursuant to environmentally stringent rules under the Federal Endangered Species Act and California Endangered Species Act.
3035	5	Stockton and San Joaquin County's primary industries are agriculture, transportation, Port of Stockton operations, and construction, and all these industries are tied to sufficient Delta water quality and quantity.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3036	1	The City of Burbank relies on State Water Project (SWP) supplies as a critical component of the community's overall water portfolio. The City of Burbank imports 100% of our water through the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD). Over the years, we have focused on what we can do locally to be less dependent on imported water. We have made great strides, but more must be done and the key factor is having a reliable supply of water while also restoring the Delta; the City of Burbank has long supported the co-equal goals of restoration and reliability. Burbank Water and Power has had a number of initiatives to become less dependent on imported water. By the end of 2015, Burbank Water and Power will be serving nearly every school in Burbank, the golf course, and a myriad of commercial, industrial, and institutional customers, which represent our largest outdoor water users, with recycled water equal to 11% of Burbank's total water supply. In addition, the Burbank community has conserved water during the drought and is well on our way to meeting our required 24% state mandatory reduction in water use. All these efforts have materially reduced Burbank's dependence on imported water, but we are at the point in time when California must renew and modernize its aging water infrastructure to create a more reliable supply of water and reduce environmental conflict.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. For more information regarding MWD Water Supply please see Master Response 35. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3036	2	As a member of Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, Burbank supports the long-standing criteria for a Delta solution as established by the Metropolitan Water District Board of Directors.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3036	3	More and better information would be helpful to compare potential water supply capabilities under various future scenarios since Metropolitan Water District of Southern California and its members have invested billions of dollars to develop a	This comment is consistent with the fundamental purpose of the project to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta, water supplies of the SWP and CVP for users located south of the Delta, and Delta water quality consistent with statutory and contractual obligations of the SWP and CVP,

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		storage and distribution system designed to capture SWP supplies when they are available and limit demands on the SWP system during dry periods. We (Burbank Water and Power) refer to this water management strategy as the "big gulp, little sip" approach.	<p>as described in Section 2.3 of Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need, 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 (also referred to as "big gulp, little sip" approach). The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods.</p> <p>The EIR/EIS addresses the changes in long-term conditions under the action alternatives (including the Proposed Project) as compared to the Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative. The changes in total exports and deliveries to all SWP and CVP water users are presented in Appendix 5A, Section C, of the EIR/EIS. The EIR/EIS discusses potential changes between the long-term analyses and real-time operation in Chapter 5; however, because the specific details of the real-time operation conditions are not specifically known at this time, the discussion is qualitative.</p>
3037	1	As a fisherman I am extremely concerned about the effect of the Delta Tunnels on salmon and other pelagic fish that rely on the Delta.	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the 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 the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Chapter 11 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect fish. The Chapter describes the impacts, and discusses measures that would be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts and to compensate for significant impacts.</p>
3037	2	The recent decimation of two years of winter-run salmon has been caused in part by mismanagement of water, specifically by exporting too much water from north state reservoirs and leaving too little for the fish to survive. The Delta Tunnels would only allow more transfers, possibly resulting in the extinction of these magnificent fish.	<p>In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by federal and State regulating agencies, ESA compliance, and project design. Operations for the proposed project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The 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. See Master Response 43 regarding water transfers.</p>
3037	3	Listed winter-run salmon (and Delta Smelt, as well) are already jeopardized without the tunnels. They would be placed in even greater jeopardy with the tunnels in place.	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the 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 the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Chapter 11 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect fish. The Chapter describes the impacts and discusses measures that would be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts and to compensate for significant impacts.
3037	4	Because the tunnels will take water around the Delta rather than through it, salt water intrusion will become more frequent. This is already affecting the Delta, but it will become worse and further degrade the Delta environment, rather than enhance it as the co-equal goals of the Delta Reform Act of 2009 require.	<p>The potential for water conveyance operations to affect salinity conditions in the Delta under Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and with implementation of each action alternative, is assessed in detail in Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Salinity in the Delta is a function of the amount and timing of freshwater input from the major tributaries, tidal action from San Francisco Bay, and exports from the Delta. During the late winter and spring months of seasonally elevated flows, and in wet years, seawater intrusion is limited and the Delta has mostly low salinity. During low-flow summer and fall months, and during dry years, lower freshwater flows result in greater amounts of seawater intrusion. Staff from DWR and USBR constantly monitor Delta water quality conditions and adjust operations of the SWP and CVP in real time as necessary to meet water quality objectives set by the State Water Resource Control Board protection of agricultural water supply, municipal and industrial drinking water supply, and fish and wildlife beneficial uses.</p> <p>In addition to potential effects associated with the action alternatives, modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the proposed project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.</p> <p>See Master Response 31 regarding the Delta Reform Act.</p>
3037	5	The major benefit of the Tunnels would accrue to water districts and farmers in the west side of the San Joaquin Valley while the major costs to repair the environmental damage they would cause would fall to the taxpayers. This fundamental unfairness alone should cause you to remove your support of this disastrous plan.	<p>See response to comment 3037-2 regarding compliance with regulatory guidelines for operation of the proposed project.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. The project would help to address the resilience and adaptability of the Delta to climate change through water delivery facilities combined with a range of operational flexibility.</p>
3037	6	The decision-making process (from the outset) has tilted in favor of increasing water exports from the Delta. This is mostly due to the composition of the group that devised the Delta Tunnels plan. Delta residents and others with better ideas were not included in the planning. Once again, this fundamental inequity should cause you to remove your support of this plan.	<p>The comment suggests that the environmental analysis process has favored an alternative that would lead to more export of water from the Delta. For more information on the decision making process, please see Master Response4.</p> <p>With regard to water export, the project is proposed to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> <p>The comment also suggests that the right stakeholders have not been involved. For more information regarding public outreach efforts, please see Master Response 40.</p>
3037	7	Consider a through-Delta project would transfer water through the Delta before exporting it to farms in the San Joaquin Valley; this would automatically protect the Delta by removing the incentive to export water when salinity intrusion extends too far,	<p>The alternatives included in the Draft EIR/EIS represent a legally adequate reasonable range of alternatives and the scope of the analysis of alternatives fully complies with both CEQA and NEPA.</p> <p>15 alternatives and 3 additional subalternatives were analyzed in the EIR/S and the RDEIR/RSEIS</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		precisely when the Delta needs protection from excessive transfers.	<p>respectively. Four major alignments have been included in the EIR/S: Through-Delta, East of the Sacramento River, West of the Sacramento River, and a Tunnel under the Delta. Many additional proposals by public and private individuals and organizations have also been evaluated and described in Chapter 3 of the EIR/S and Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1.</p> <p>Regarding development of alternatives for the EIR/EIS, a description of the process the Lead Agencies followed to develop and screen alternatives is provided in Master Response 4.</p>
3038	1	Follow India's example and put a solar cover on the existing aqueducts to reduce water loss from evaporation.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Appendix 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 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed and Master Response 6 regarding demand management.</p> <p>New energy generation facilities are outside the scope of the proposed project; however, nothing in the project would prevent other entities from pursuing innovative approaches to water conservation or energy production.</p>
3038	2	Current weather patterns are causing draught in the north west including Northern Californis. Last year's "arctic" storms all hit the Midwest and east coast. That is a permanent change there won't be enough water to divert.	<p>As described in Chapter 5, Water Supply, the No Action Alternative and the action alternatives are evaluated with assumptions for future climate change and sea level rise. As indicated in Chapter 5, the effects of climate change and sea level rise will reduce available water supplies for many water users, including the SWP and CVP water users.</p> <p>The anticipated hydrologic changes due to climate change (increased temperatures and more years of critical dryness, increased water temperatures, changes in precipitation and runoff patterns, sea level rise, and tidal variations) will indeed constrain and challenge future water management practices across the state, with or without the projects. The state is addressing climate change through strategies and a decision-making framework as outlined in the California Climate Adaptation Strategy and Adaptation Planning Guide. However, no single project and indeed none of the action alternatives would be able to completely counteract all of the impacts of climate change.</p> <p>The project would help to address the resilience and adaptability of the Delta to climate change through added water management flexibility created by new water diversions and operational scenarios. Under the Proposed Project, SWP and CVP exports would be similar or less than under Existing Conditions or the No Action Alternative. 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 in drier periods.</p>
3039	1	If the south state needs water let them fight with Nestle to stop them from taking and bottling their water.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
3040	1	Do it right for the people not for the Governor or big money.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
3041	1	<p>I have never asked for a favor or bothered you when other matters were on my mind. But this issue can be solved by the proper use of the water experts that I know. These people are brilliant and are true gems in my long career in water issues.</p> <p>John please feel free to contact me at my e-mail or home phone 707-239-0175 or cell 707-239-0175.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
3042	1	Ma Nature spent some eons developing the ecosystem that includes the Delta and all the creatures and plants that inhabit it. We humans have no right to mess with this, especially since we have proven we do not have the "smarts" to know how to work with the entire ecosystem--we keep messing with one part and acting surprised when other parts collapse.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
3043	1	Be pro California not pro population explosion!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. For more information regarding growth inducement effects please see Chapter 30 of the FEIR/EIS.</p>
3044	1	I am completely opposed to the current "California WaterFix". It may fix the water supply problem for Southern California, but it will lead to the destruction of the Delta. We have traveled often to Southern California in the last couple of years and we're appalled at the lack of conservation measures being taken there. We've let our lawn die and see brown all around us in Northern California, while it appears little is being done in Southern California to conserve.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for more information on the purpose and need for the project, Master Response 35 regarding water use in Southern California, and Master Response 6 regarding demand management.
3045	1	The removal of a large slug of fresh water from the pipeline will allow salt water to flow up the pipeline into the Delta. This very effectively destroys the Delta environment.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS.</p>
3047	1	<p>We have relied on massive water transfers throughout the state to try to solve our water issues.</p> <p>So far the apportioning system is neither socially fair nor economically effective.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>See Master Response 43 for more information on water transfers. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
3047	2	<p>It is policy, especially around Southland agriculture, that needs to change. Switch to drip irrigation. Stop growing alfalfa for export.</p> <p>Develop localized systems of conservation.</p>	<p>The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of a particular water supply augmentation approach (greater conservation) and does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the proposed project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>For more information regarding agricultural beneficial water use please see Master Response 34.</p>
3047	3	Thank you for preserving habitat, farmland and the San Francisco estuary by stopping this plan.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3048	1	Since climate forecasts for California predict warmer seasons, less snow, and variable rain in northern California there will never be enough water to send south and meet the coequal goals.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The hydrologic analysis in the EIR/S considered changes over long-term conditions which includes high flow events and drought periods, conditions similar to the 1976-1977 and 1987-1992 droughts, as described in Appendix 5A, Modeling Technical Appendix. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. Senior water rights holders are not affected by implementation of action alternatives. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation would be able to pump from the proposed north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the proposed project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S. In addition to permitting constraints on daily operations of the SWP and CVP, DWR and Reclamation must maintain proper performance and bypass flows across fish screens when endangered and threatened fish species are present within the north Delta facilities area.</p> <p>The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a statewide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).</p>
3049	1	Please consider the long-term impact on California's environment and the long-term repercussions for California residents.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
3050	1	We need to keep the Delta as an ecosystem and not depend on funneling more water from already stressed water supplies and rivers.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
3050	2	Thank you for showing environmental leadership and economic foresight in this matter.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3051	1	The extreme drought in Australia was not fixed by huge infrastructure--the desalination plant built at enormous cost is barely used. Instead it was small local actions--conservation, grey water use, rainwater and underground storage, that got them through.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change with continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3051	2	Our water supply can be better secured in the future by investing in our depleted aquifers, which are the only things large enough to replace the long-term storage that the Sierra snowpack used to provide. Groundwater storage provides a cost-effective, locally driven method of providing both seasonal and year to year water storage.	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 groundwater storage, surface water storage, 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).
3055	1	A methodology section was added (Sect 11.3.2) to help explain effects determinations for the Fish and Aquatic resources section. It was helpful to see the outline of the models and analysis that were used to determine an effect but not always clear on which model or method was given the highest weight and why (Table 11.14, Table 11.15, Table 11.16 and Table 11.17). It would be useful to crosscheck determinations across all Alternatives with the baseline to ensure consistency in effects determinations. It would also be useful to develop a table that highlights which effect in any of the Alternatives rose to an Adverse or Beneficial determination in all or any of the lifestages/categories affected (i.e., migration in Delta or spawning upstream), and then clearly lists what caused the effect (i.e., greater than 15% change in flow upstream in key migratory months(s) of April and June) using criteria specified in the methodology section.	The effects in the Final EIR/EIS were cross-checked again based on the described methodology to ensure consistency with the approach across all alternatives. A summary table of effects is included in the Executive Summary within the FEIR.
3055	2	The table on page 11-591 is a good example of consolidating results in a way that enables the reader to see previous determinations coupled with the new determinations made for those Alternatives. Following this table is description of why the changes were made. This allows the reader to focus in one area for that subset of Alternatives and associated changes which is necessary in such a large document. It could be further improved if the determinations that resulted in the change of status were highlighted in a table as mentioned above (what lifestage(s), what key driver (15% change in key migratory months)). This is the case in other areas as well. For example, there was text describing results in multiple locations (Mokelumne, Feather, etc.) for certain species (fall-run/late fall-run) yet lack of clarity regarding what was determined. Additionally, it would help to have a thorough examination of the Alternatives that resulted in Not Adverse to corroborate they fell within the methodology of causing no quantifiable changes above the baseline (NAA [No Action Alternative]).	Where possible and reasonable given the already large size of the document, the authors consolidated and summarized results. All determinations for an individual impact were corroborated with one another. Please see Table ES-8 in the Executive Summary of the Final EIR/EIS for the ultimate summary of impacts.
3055	3	As an example of inconsistent methodology, look at the determinations for "Entrainment of winter-run." Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 6, 9 were determined to have Beneficial effects for winter-run entrainment. Alternatives 4, 5, 7, 8 were determined to be Not Adverse [NA]. From viewing the results of all the Alternatives in comparison to baseline, NMFS feels it is clear that Alternative 7 and 8 were beneficial and provided more benefit than Alternatives 1, 2 and 3. However, Alternative 3 should have been labelled NA and Alternative 4 Beneficial. The reasoning evident for why the determinations were made is unclear (see attached result sheet -- Appendix A [ATT1]). NMFS believes there were other inconsistencies in determinations for other life-stages and categories, particularly those that were more complex and involved multiple analysis or lines of evidence.	Impact determinations in the FEIR/EIS were revised to address inconsistency issues.
3055	4	Areas that could use improvement include combining results from multiple rivers to come to one conclusion on effects. The Sacramento River should have been given separate weighting from any of the other rivers in making determinations. The Project/Alternatives effects are concentrated in the Sacramento River and Delta which is a large enough area to consider without confounding results and determinations with all the other rivers. If any of the tributary river flow patterns were affected due to being	The authors appreciate the suggestions for approaching the analysis. Ultimately, the approach chosen is described in the Section 11.3.2, Methods of Analysis. It is important to note that some of these suggested methods were used, such as assessing each river independently, then reviewing all rivers and making a final determination with rationale.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		managed directly by CVP/SWP operations under the Project/Alternative, it would have helped to have them assessed independently in effects determinations so that all rivers would have equal weighting and not be overshadowed by effect (or lack of effects) in a different river. If necessary, after assessing and making a determination on each species/river independently, the results for all the rivers could then be listed and a final determination with rationale included.	
3055	5	The Delta analysis was sparse and Table 11.17 indicated that only the DPM [Delta Passage Model] and flow changes from CalSIM were used. It would help to have the Newman and Perry analysis that was undertaken be available to assess this critical part of the project area under the Alternatives. Predation was applied to the ND [north Delta] intakes and that was helpful in the sense that the more intakes the greater the predation effect, but it did not really relate to flow changes caused by the project so may not be a complete consideration of predation risk.	As the commenter notes, additional through-Delta survival analyses (analyses based on Newman [2003] and Perry [2010] to the DPM have been undertaken for Alternative 4A (California Water Fix). These analyses produce the same conclusion as the DPM and so are not necessary for all alternatives, but have been incorporated in the FEIR/EIS through incorporation by reference of the Biological Assessment. Regarding the comment about predation, analyses such as the DPM deal with predation and flow because survival as a function of flow is related to predation (at the far-field, whole-Delta scale).
3055	6	Alternative 4 was difficult to assess in whole as it had four different operating scenarios. The high outflow (H4) and the low outflow (H1) were different enough to make consolidating results of this Alternative unfeasible. The effects determinations of this Alternative really depended on what scenario was analyzed. It would have helped if it was made clear to the reader that the Alternative could be called Not Adverse or Beneficial based on any one of the scenarios meeting that criteria but that the opposite did not apply (i.e., the Alternative would not be called Adverse if one of the scenarios resulted in an adverse effect as that particular scenario would likely not be forwarded.) For the preferred alternative, again, we [NMFS] anticipate some of the discussions and work as part of the BA [Biological Assessment] will be incorporated into the Final EIS to assist with this determination.	This Final EIR/EIS has been updated to reflect analyses for fish and terrestrial species in the California WaterFix Biological Assessment. Alternative 4A includes starting operations ranging from H3 to H4 In this Final EIR/EIS. Appropriate analyses distinguish between effects of operational scenario H3 and H4.
3055	7	[ATT1: Appendix A -- Chinook salmon entrainment indices for Alternatives.]	This comment is a table from the RDEIR/RDEIS that is attached to the comment letter.
3055	8	[Page] 1-2 [Line] 13: Change "application of" to "application for".	This change has been made in Chapter 1, Introduction, of the Final EIR/EIS.
3055	9	[Page] 1-3 [Line] 27: Delete "using a shorter duration." There is no specific duration identified for the proposed action in the ESA section 7 consultation process.	This change has not been made because the discussion cited is of action alternatives, not of the statutory process.
3055	10	[Page] 1-13 [Line] 32: Add "/California WaterFix" after "BDCP" to accurately reflect the range of alternatives discussed in the RDEIR/SDEIS.	"BDCP" has been changed to "action alternatives" in Chapter 1, Introduction, Section 1.6.2.1 in the Final EIR/EIS.
3055	11	[Page] 1-13 [Line] 34: Add "listed" before "species" to accurately reflect the text of ESA Section 7(a)(2).	This change has been made in Chapter 1, Introduction, Section 1.6.2.1 in the Final EIR/EIS.
3055	12	[Page] 1-13 [Line] 35: Add "adverse" before "modification" to accurately reflect the text of ESA Section 7(a)(2).	This change has been made in Chapter 1, Introduction, Section 1.6.2.1 in the Final EIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3055	13	[Page] 1-13 [Line] 36: Change "Section 9 prohibits" to "Section 9 and regulations promulgated under Section 4(d) prohibit", because ESA Section 9 prohibits the taking of endangered species and regulations promulgated under Section 4(d) prohibit the taking of threatened species. See page 1-14, lines 16-17.	This change has been made in Chapter 1, Introduction, Section 1.6.2.1 in the Final EIR/EIS.
3055	14	[Page] 1-14 [Line] 11: Change "authorizes a specified level of take" to "specifies the impact (i.e., the amount or extent) of incidental taking of the species" to accurately reflect ESA section 7(b)(4)(i) and 50 CFR 402.14(i).	This change has been made in Chapter 1, Introduction, Section 1.6.2.1 in the Final EIR/EIS.
3055	15	[Page] 1-14 [Line] 12: Add "and terms and conditions that must be complied with to implement the reasonable and prudent measures" after "take" in order to accurately reflect 50 CFR 402.14(i)(1)(iv) and 50 CFR 402.14(i)(5), which is cited at the end of this sentence.	This change has been made in Chapter 1, Introduction, Section 1.6.2.1 in the Final EIR/EIS.
3055	16	[Page] 1-14 [Line] 13-14: Change "and that must be implemented as a condition of the take authorization (50 CFR 402.14(i)(5))" to a new sentence that provides, "Any taking which is in compliance with the terms and conditions of the incidental take statement is not a prohibited taking under the ESA, and no other authorization or permit under the ESA is required." This change is necessary to accurately reflect 50 CFR 402.14(i)(5) and ESA Section 7(o)(2).	This change has been made in Chapter 1, Introduction, Section 1.6.2.1 in the Final EIR/EIS.
3055	17	[Page] 1-14 [Line] 19: Add "pursue" after "harm" in order to accurately reflect the definition of "take" under the ESA (16 USC 1532(19)).	This change has been made in Chapter 1, Introduction, Section 1.6.2.1 in the Final EIR/EIS.
3055	18	[Page] 1-14 [Line] 23: Add "spawning, rearing, migrating" after "breeding" in order to accurately reflect the definition of "harm" in 50 CFR 222.102.	Text modified to reflect the comment.
3055	19	[Page] 1-14 [Line] 24: Add "; 50 CFR 222.102" after "50 CFR 17.3" in order to cite NMFS' regulatory definition of "harm" in addition to FWS' regulatory definition.	Text modified to reflect the comment.
3055	20	[Page] 1-14 [Line] 24-25: Change "unless take is otherwise specifically authorized or permitted pursuant to the provisions of" to "except as specifically provided under the ESA, including". First, Section 7 does not provide for authorizations or permits, it provides for exemptions and exceptions. See ESA section 7(o). Second, as provided in ESA Section 9, there are some other exceptions, such as 16 U.S.C. [Section] 1535(g)(2) and ESA section 9(b). However, these exceptions are not relevant to the proposed action or alternatives and do not need to be specifically listed.	This text has been changed to "except as specifically provided under Section 7 or Section 10 of the ESA" in Chapter 1, Introduction, Section 1.6.2.1 in the Final EIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3055	21	[Page] 1-14 [Line] 35: Change "that meets the following five issuance criteria" to "FWS or NMFS must find with respect to the permit application and HCP [Habitat Conservation Plan] that" in order to be consistent with ESA Section 10(a)(2).	The text has been changed in in the Final EIR/EIS at Chapter 1, Introduction, Section 1.6.2.1, to the following sentence: "For an applicant to obtain a Section 10(a)(1)(B) permit, USFWS or NMFS must find that the permit application and HCP meet the following five issuance criteria."
3055	22	[Page] 1-15 [Line] 1-2: Delete ", including the requirement to obtain incidental take authorization". This change is necessary to accurately reflect ESA Section 7(b)(4), ESA Section 7(o)(2), and 50 CFR 402.14(i).	This change has not been made because the discussion is of the proposed project and action alternatives, not of the statute.
3055	23	[Page] 1-15 [Line] 16: Change "authorizing incidental take of federally listed species" to "including an incidental take statement for federally listed species" in order to accurately reflect ESA Section 7(b)(4), ESA Section 7(o)(2), and 50 CFR 402.14(i).	This change has been made in Chapter 1, Introduction, Section 1.6.2.1 of the Final EIR/EIS.
3055	24	[Page] 1-15 [Line] 32: Change "267" to "297" in order to correct the citation for the Sustainable Fisheries Act.	Text modified to reflect the comment.
3055	25	[Page] 1-15 [Line] 33: Add "adversely" after "may" in order to accurately reflect the statutory section cited in this sentence.	This change has been made in Chapter 1, Introduction, of the Final EIR/EIS.
3055	26	[Page] 1-16 [Line] 2-3: Change "through NMFS' issuance of the BiOp [Biological Opinion] through Section 7 of the ESA" to "integrated with consultation under Section 7 of the ESA" in order to accurately reflect integration of EFH [essential fish habitat] and ESA Section 7 consultation. See NMFS' Essential Fish Habitat Consultation Guidance, Version 1.1, April 2004, available at http://www.habitat.noaa.gov/pdf/efhconsultationguidancev1_1.pdf	This change has been made in Chapter 1, Introduction, Section 1.6.2.1 of the Final EIR/EIS.
3055	27	[Page] 1-16 [Line] 36: Add "a" before "permit."	This change has been made in Chapter 1, Introduction, of the Final EIR/EIS.
3055	28	[Page] 1-25, Table 1-1: In Other Considerations related to the National Marine Fisheries Service, change "Magnuson-Stevens Fisheries Conservation and Management Act" to "Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act" in order to accurately reflect the name of the Act. See 16 U.S.C. 1801 notes and page 1-15 of the RDEIR/SDEIS.	This change has been made in Chapter 1, Introduction, of the Final EIR/EIS.
3055	29	[Page] 2-1 [Line] 10: Change "nonimpact" to "on impact".	This text has been removed from the Final EIR/EIS.
3055	30	[Page] 2-2 [Line] 40:	This text has been removed from the Final EIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Change "indicted" to "indicated".	
3055	31	[Page] 4.1-3 [Lines] 20, 22: Delete the quotation marks on these lines, because the phrase within these quotation marks is not a direct quote from 40 CFR 1503.4(a), which is cited in a footnote after the quotation marks.	This change has been made in Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives, in the Final EIR/EIS.
3055	32	[Page] 4.1-3 [Lines] 30, 31: Delete the quotation marks on these lines, because the phrase within these quotation marks is not a direct quote from 40 CFR 1503.4(a), which is cited in a footnote after the quotation marks.	This change has been made in Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives, in the Final EIR/EIS.
3055	33	[Page] 4.1-4 [Line] 13: Add "be" before "implemented".	This change has been made in Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives, in the Final EIR/EIS.
3055	34	[Page] 4.1-5, Table 4.1-1: This table provides that Alternative 4A operations are evaluated as Scenarios H3-H4 at the early long term (ELT, which is associated with conditions around 2025, but Alternative 4 operations are evaluated to LLT [Late Long Term]. In addition, this table provides that the NEPA Baseline for Alternative 4A is the No Action Alternative at ELT, but the NEPA Baseline for Alternative 4 is the No Action Alternative at LLT. However, Alternative 4A is for an indefinite period. Therefore, it is unclear why its operations are evaluated at different term or timeframe, and it is unclear why the NEPA Baseline is described as a different term or timeframe.	Please see Master Response 30 which provides additional information regarding the modeling approach.
3055	35	[Page] 4.1-6 [Line] 16-22: Ensure that the discussion on these lines is consistent with the final biological assessment for the California WaterFix.	This comment has been noted. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3056	1	I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Delta Tunnels plan. The Delta Reform Act of 2009, in which the California State Legislature committed to the "coequal goals" of providing a more reliable water supply for California and protecting and restoring the cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of the Delta, cannot be upheld if the Delta Tunnels come to pass. The California WaterFix does not meet the restoration goals of the Delta Reform Act; it is simply a plan to export more water out of the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary. The Delta Tunnels will also fail to provide more reliable water because the Delta watershed is already oversubscribed by five times in normal water years. My objections to the tunnels are threefold: The California WaterFix does not address the environmental, public health or economic impacts of the proposed Delta tunnels project. Also, the plan ignores alternatives that would save California tax and ratepayers billions of dollars, while investing in the jobs and local water sources that build sustainability.	For more information regarding Delta Reform Act compliance for the BDCP and the proposed project (4A), please see Master Response 31 Appendix 3I and 3J of this Final EIR/EIS, respectively. 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. The 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 operations timing designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.
3056	2	My environmental concern with the plan [is]:	The Proposed Project has been developed with the goal of minimizing and avoiding incidental take of listed species to the maximum extent practicable. Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 12,

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		The impact on wildlife and plant species in the Delta that depend on freshwater include the Delta smelt, Chinook salmon, steelhead, San Joaquin kit fox, and tricolored blackbird, protected species already on the brink that will face decimation due to a diminishing food-web.	Terrestrial Biological Resources, Final EIR/EIS, describe effects of the Proposed Project and several alternatives on fish and wildlife species in the Plan Area, and mitigation for these impacts. Refer also to Master Response 17 (Biological Resources). Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act requires that federal agencies, in consultation with the federal fish and wildlife agencies, ensure that their actions are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of species or result in modification or destruction of critical habitat. The California WaterFix Biological Assessment was submitted to the USFWS and NMFS in August 2016. As of the writing of this Final EIR/EIS, federal consultation is proceeding. Refer also to Master Response 29 (Timing of ESA Compliance).
3056	3	My environmental concern with the plan [is]: At sea, even the ESA-listed South Pacific Puget Sound Orca Whales depend on migrating Delta species that will be harmed by less water flowing through the Delta.	Refer to response to Comment 2 in this letter.
3056	4	My environmental concern with the plan [is]: The tunnels plan seems to ignore Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act which prohibits federal agency actions that are likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered species or that "result in the destruction or adverse modification of [critical] habitat of [listed] species."	Refer to the response to Comment 2 in this letter.
3056	5	My public health concern with the plan [is]: The tunnels will cause increased contamination of municipal water and wells for the millions of rural and urban residents living in the five Delta counties.	The potential for proposed project alternatives to affect water quality constituents of concern for municipal water supply uses in the project area is assessed in detail in Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the Final EIR/S. Where significant impacts to uses could occur due to the alternative, mitigation to lessen those impacts is provided.
3056	6	My public health concern with the plan [is]: The tunnels plan fails to model for potential increases of carcinogens and other formation of byproducts that would cause cancer and other serious health effects.	A health risk assessment (HRA) was developed in support of Chapter 22, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, of the Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS). This HRA evaluates the human health risks resulting from construction emissions produced by the proposed water conveyance alternatives. HRA evaluates the human health risks resulting from exposure to construction emission produced by each BDCP alternative. Construction activities generate toxic air contaminants (TACs) that include exhaust emissions from diesel and gasoline fuel combustion. In addition to TAC emissions, this analysis also evaluates PM2.5 concentrations resulting from PM2.5 emitted by exhaust from both diesel and gasoline engine combustion and from fugitive dust generation. Additionally, in Chapter 22, where the impact analysis determines that there would be a significant impact related to changes in air quality such that sensitive receptors would potentially experience excess cancer risk as a result of constructing the water conveyance facilities, Mitigation Measure AQ-16 would be implemented. As part of this mitigation, to avoid exposing sensitive receptors to substantial DPM concentrations, DWR will provide individuals residing in areas where construction activities associated with the project would create DPM concentrations in excess of air district cancer risk thresholds the opportunity to relocate either temporarily during the construction period or permanently, at the discretion of the affected individuals. Otherwise, there would be no need for residents in proximity to the water conveyance facilities to evacuate their homes due to increase cancer risk. Potential health concerns related to EMF exposure in general are discussed in Section 25.1.1.5 of the Final EIR/EIS. As discussed in Section 25.1.1.5, the potential health risk from EMF exposure is unknown because over the past 20 years some scientific studies have shown associations between cancers and EMF exposure while others have been less conclusive. Some studies have shown an association between EMF exposure and increased risks of leukemia, brain cancer, and amyotrophic lateral sclerosis; however, the National Research Council and the National Institute of Health have concluded that there is no strong evidence showing that EMF exposures pose a health risk.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3056	7	<p>My public health concern with the plan [is]:</p> <p>Environmental justice communities, who depend on subsistence fishing, will also face food and health insecurities as a result of increased contaminants, specifically mercury contamination, in fish and wildlife populations.</p>	<p>Additional detail related to microcystis (due to longer residence times of water) and mercury and selenium related to subsistence fishing was added to Chapter 28, Environmental Justice, in the RDEIR/SDEIS. As described under each alternative in Chapter 28 for Impact PH-3, the associated increase in human consumption of mercury caused by the action alternatives would depend upon the selection of the fishing location (and associated local fish body burdens), and the relative proportion of different Delta fish consumed. Different fish species would suffer bioaccumulation at different rates associated with the specific species; therefore the specific spectrum of fish consumed by a population would determine the effect of increased mercury body burdens in individual fish species. These confounding factors make demonstration of precise impacts on human populations infeasible. However, because minority populations are known to practice subsistence fishing and consume fish exceeding US EPA reference doses, any increase in the fish body burden of mercury may contribute to an existing adverse effect. Because subsistence fishing is specifically associated with minority populations in the Delta compared to the population at large, this effect would be disproportionate on those populations. This effect would be adverse. For additional information regarding water quality impacts, including microcystis, please see Master Response 14 and Master Response 31.</p>
3056	8	<p>My economic concern with the plan [is]:</p> <p>For large metropolitan cities such as Los Angeles and San Jose that depend on export water, water rates and/or property taxes will go up, but they will get no additional water.</p>	<p>One of the purposes of the proposed project is to increase water supply reliability in the SWP/CVP export service area. The project's proposed dual conveyance facilities would allow water to be moved through the Delta when conditions permit, and allow water to be diverted from the Sacramento River in the northern Delta when conditions in the south Delta do not permit diversions from the existing State Water Project and Central Valley Project facilities. The location of the north Delta diversion facility is less vulnerable to salinity intrusion, a potential impact of sea level rise, or levee failure, in the future. By establishing an alternative diversion point for exports, a great deal of water management flexibility is added. This added flexibility would provide more options for adaptively managing the Delta so that conditions can be optimized to provide the greatest benefits across all Delta water uses and habitat conditions. Refer to Master Response 3 for more information on the purpose and need for the proposed project.</p> <p>The construction of the water delivery facilities is estimated to cost \$14.9 billion, an amount that would be paid for by the state and federal water contractors who rely on Delta exports. The range of costs for water 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 information regarding funding of the proposed project.</p>
3056	9	<p>My economic concern with the plan [is]:</p> <p>No analysis has been done on how the lack of fresh water flows will impact San Francisco Bay tourism and recreation. These industries depend on Delta fresh water flows for their crab and salmon fisheries, wildlife sighting, boating, and their restaurant economy. This industry is worth billions annually.</p>	<p>As described in Chapter 6, Surface Water, Section 6.3, in San Francisco Bay, Central Coast, South Coast, Tulare Lake, South Lahontan, and Colorado River hydrologic basins, SWP/CVP water supplies are conveyed in pipelines and canals and do not directly affect surface waters. Construction of facilities under the alternatives all would occur in the Delta of the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River basins. Therefore, the environmental consequences are focused on changes in surface water resources in the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River basins and the Delta. Impacts are not expected in the San Francisco Bay.</p> <p>As described in Impact ECON-5 under Alternative 4A in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, construction of water conveyance structures would be anticipated to result in a lower-quality recreational experience in a number of localized areas throughout the Delta, despite the implementation of environmental commitments. With a decrease in recreational quality, particularly for boating and fishing (two of the most popular activities in the Delta), the number of visits would be anticipated to decline, at least in areas close to construction activities. Under this alternative, recreational uses in the Delta at Clifton Court Forebay and in small areas of the</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Cosumnes River Preserve on Staten Island would be directly affected by construction activities. Six other recreational sites or areas would experience periods of construction-related effects, including noise, access, visual disturbances, or a combination of these effects. As described under Impact REC-2 in Chapter 15, Recreation, these include Clarksburg Boat Launch (fishing access), Stone Lakes NWR, Wimpy's Marina, Delta Meadows River Park, Bullfrog Landing Marina, and Lazy M Marina. Overall, the multi-year schedule and geographic scale of construction activities and the anticipated decline in recreational spending would be considered an adverse effect. The commitments and mitigation measures cited above would contribute to the reduction of this effect.</p> <p>An assessment of water quality effects resulting from changing Delta water quality and outflows on San Francisco Bay water quality is provided in Impact WQ-34 in Chapter 8, Water Quality, for all alternatives. The water quality assessment considered potential changes in constituent levels for all constituents of concern assessed in detail in Impacts WQ-1 through WQ-30, including changes in salinity, mercury, nutrients, and selenium. The assessment concluded that Alternative 4A would have a less than significant impact to San Francisco Bay water quality.</p>
3056	10	<p>My economic concern with the plan [is]:</p> <p>Salinity intrusion is already impacting the western Delta farms and removing Sacramento River freshwater from the system will make matters worse. Delta farmers cannot irrigate crops with salt water and they certainly cannot plant crops in contaminated soils. The Delta agriculture economy, which consists of generations of family farms and farmworkers, generates \$5.2 billion for the California economy, annually.</p>	<p>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 could occur due to the alternative, mitigation to lessen those impacts is provided.</p>
3056	11	<p>My economic concern with the plan [is]:</p> <p>California coastal fishing communities depend on thriving wildlife. This historic industry is worth billions annually, with the salmon industry worth \$1.5 billion annually alone. Thousands of jobs and livelihoods are tied to these industries.</p>	<p>Chapter 11 of the Final EIR/EIS, Fish and Aquatic Resources, indicates that effects on fish would not be adverse for the preferred alternative, Alternative 4A. Therefore, there would be no adverse effects to the coastal fishing industry due to the proposed project.</p>
3056	12	<p>My economic concern with the plan [is]:</p> <p>The operation and construction of the tunnels will obstruct and disable navigable waterways for boating, marinas and other types of leisure activities, in addition to creating conditions of low water flow that will foster invasive aquatic species, such as water hyacinth. Poor water quality also creates unsafe recreation. Recreation and tourism in the Delta generate \$750 million annually.</p>	<p>Impacts TRANS-13, TRANS-17, and TRANS-19 discuss potential effects on navigation caused by the proposed project.</p> <p>Because it does not involve a physical change in the environment, effects to navigation caused by changes in surface water elevation, by themselves, are not considered environmental impacts under CEQA. Any secondary physical environmental impacts that may result are covered under other impacts. Nonetheless, as explained above, changes in surface water elevation during the construction and operation of the intakes will not have a significant impact on navigation.</p>
3056	13	<p>Far, far less expensive and less environmentally destructive alternatives to the Delta Tunnels were largely ignored. The plan does not seriously consider any alternatives other than new, upstream conveyance. The decision-making process (from the outset) has tilted in favor of increasing water exports from the Delta.</p>	<p>See Appendix 3A (Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives) of this Final EIR/EIS for a detailed explanation of the alternative development process. Refer also to Master Response 4 for a summary of the selection of alternatives and Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the proposed project.</p>
3056	14	<p>Our tax and ratepayer dollars would be much better spent on:</p> <p>More aggressive water efficiency program statewide that would apply to both urban and agricultural users.</p>	<p>Appendix 1C of the Final EIR/EIS, Water 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 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. Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the proposed project.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3056	15	<p>Our tax and ratepayer dollars would be much better spent on:</p> <p>Funding water recycling and groundwater recharging projects statewide that would be billions of dollars less expensive for ratepayers than constructing a new version of the Peripheral Canal or major new surface storage dams. Meanwhile, these projects move communities towards water sustainability.</p>	Refer to response to comment 14 in this letter.
3056	16	<p>Our tax and ratepayer dollars would be much better spent on:</p> <p>Retiring thousands of acres of impaired and pollution generating farmlands in the southern San Joaquin Valley and using those lands for more sustainable and profitable uses, such as solar energy generation.</p>	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the proposed project.
3056	17	<p>Our tax and ratepayer dollars would be much better spent on:</p> <p>Improving Delta levees in order to address potential earthquake, flooding, and future sea level rise concerns at a cost between \$2 [and] \$4 billion and is orders of magnitude less expensive than major conveyance projects that are currently being contemplated.</p>	Please see Chapter 2, FEIR/EIS, for the BDCP/CWF purpose and need, and Appendix 6A Sections 6A.2 and 6A.3 for discussion on existing levee improvement programs and funding mechanisms, which would not be affected by the BDCP/CWF. Levees are an important public safety resource and the proposed project would not change levee policy or replace ongoing programs and grant projects aimed at facilitating and supporting levee improvements in or outside the Delta. It recognized that levee maintenance and safety in the Delta is an important issue for the residents of the Delta and for statewide interests.
3056	18	<p>Our tax and ratepayer dollars would be much better spent on:</p> <p>Increasing freshwater flows through the Delta to reduce pollutants so ecosystems and wildlife can be restored.</p>	Refer to response to comment 16 in this letter.
3056	19	<p>Our tax and ratepayer dollars would be much better spent on:</p> <p>Installing fish screens at the south Delta pumps to reduce the current salvage of marine life.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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 require active collection and salvage of fishes.</p> <p>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 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. Please also refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the proposed project.</p>
3056	20	<p>The Delta has problems that need to be addressed, but the California WaterFix tunnels are a 20th century idea that won't fix them. It won't produce more water, more reliable supplies, or improved conditions for the environment in the Delta.</p> <p>The new EIR/EIS has not adequately addressed my above stated concerns. That is why I</p>	The proposed project is designed 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		oppose the Delta Tunnels/California WaterFix (Alternative 4A). Reclamation and DWR should prepare and circulate a new Draft EIR/EIS that will include alternatives that reduce water exports and increase Delta flows for consideration by the public and decision-makers. Such alternatives have a far better chance of complying with the Delta Reform Act and the federal Endangered Species and Clean Water Acts.	would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. With regards to alternatives development, please see Master Response 4. With regards to timing of ESA compliance, please see Master Response 29. With regards to compliance with the Delta Reform Act, please see Master Response 31.
3057	1	This is a bad deal for everyone in the State except Brown's corporate farm campaign contributors.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3058	1	The Delta Tunnels are not a solution to California's water woes, nor were the Peripheral Canal boondoggle. We need to look at other countries and within ourselves to find water saving and collection methods that ranchers, farmers and urban folk can use.	It is important to note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 36 (Peripheral Canal) and Master Response 4 (Alternatives).
3059	1	This is an insane use of money. Boondoggle!	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.
3060	1	I grew up on the Delta, and these tunnels will destroy it. They only benefit Southern California	DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.
3061	1	The Delta tunnels will kill the most magnificent estuary on the west coast of the Americas and the future of 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 to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.
3062	1	Tunnels are a huge waste of taxpayers dollars!	DWR acknowledges your opposition to the project. The comment does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3063	1	The tunnel plan is Governor Browns' 40 year wet dream. It will destroy the Sacramento/San Francisco Delta. We need a higher authority to stop Brown since the	The BDCP process was initiated by former Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, who was twice elected by a majority of California voters. The process has continued under the administration of his successor, Edmund

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		tunnels are not a ballot issue in Northern California where the affected region exists.	<p>G. Brown, Jr., who has publicly stated his tentative support for Alternative 4 as set forth in the EIR/EIS, though he has acknowledged the need to complete environmental review and to obtain additional public input prior to making any final decisions on the project. The BDCP, then, was initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole.</p> <p>The proposed project has been under the stewardship of Edmund G. Brown, Jr., who has publicly stated his support for Alternative 4A, or California WaterFix, as set forth in the RDEIR/SDEIS. A List of Preparers can be found in Section 6 of the RDEIR/SDEIS which includes prepares who were involved since the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS.</p>
3064	1	This is Jerry wanting to complete what his papa started so many years ago. I hope it is political suicide for the idiots in Sacramento, but people in Southern California do not give any thought to the fact that if this happens they will be the losers eventually also. Face it they have more votes than we do!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3065	1	The tunnels are a bad idea. You are just draining the water from the reservoirs we currently have, as well as the Delta, which many people count on for their livelihoods	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Water delivered to the SWP and CVP water contractors participating in proposed project would be within the existing contract amounts to serve agricultural lands that have been cultivated and existing and planned community populations. As described in Chapter 5, Water Supply, of the EIR/S, it is anticipated that climate change would result in more frequent and more severe rainfall events and less snowfall than under historic conditions. These rainfall events would result in periods of time when the capacity of the existing intakes would not be adequate. Therefore, the proposed project would provide the maximum capacity in the intakes and tunnels during those periods of time to convey water during extremely wet periods to areas south of the Delta for storage and use during drier times. The proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase flows in the wet winter months when the river flows are high to improve conditions for aquatic resources. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries in drier periods.</p> <p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.</p>
3065	2	The state needs to look into creating more water storage and ways to create water (desalination plants).	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
3066	1	This is a water grab that will not benefit California's future.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3067	1	The tunnels are an ill thought out water grab by big agriculture, who are growing water thirsty crops in the desert. No responsibility, no sustainability, no plan for California's future water needs. Just flat out selfishness and greed to grow the bottom line for big	The issue of big agriculture is outside the scope of the proposed project. Please see Master Response 34 for information on beneficial use of water. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Agriculture.	
3068	1	Between technology, conservation and additional storage, this is what will resolve this issue for future generations. Building aqueducts was a Roman invention 3000 years ago. California, with Silicon Valley following in the Roman's footsteps, is more of a governmental trait and not entrepreneurial. We Californians expect more from our leaders today or we need to find new leadership.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3069	1	This is the most irresponsible Southern California water grab imaginable. Let them start desalination projects immediately and leave our Delta alone!	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 51 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
3070	1	The Governor will devastate the Delta with his plan for tunnels and ruin Northern California by sending our water South	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.
3071	1	These tunnels are a boondoggle that will stick California taxpayers' with huge a tax burden for decades to come! No tunnels! There are better ideas.	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.
3072	1	I love on the Delta and want my children to enjoy it as I have.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3073	1	We need to be cutting back on water used for agriculture in the state and growing water wise crops in low evaporation regions as well as regulating groundwater use.	<p>The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of a particular water supply augmentation approach (greater agricultural conservation and regulated groundwater use) and does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the proposed project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>For more information regarding agricultural beneficial water use please see Master Response 34.</p>
3073	2	Keep ecosystems healthy and in-tact, don't put them and the wildlife that are a part of them at risk by sending water to Southern California.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).</p>
3074	1	The tunnels will destroy the Delta	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3075	1	These tunnels will destroy, not help.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3076	1	The Delta will be ruined! These tunnels will help big business in Southern California. The State is going to use eminent domain to steal lan from 300 farms. This has got to be stopped.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3077	1	We raised our kids on the Delta; we have boated, camped, held family events and even had a wedding or two. Not to mention that my grandson is now a master fisher kid. The tunnels will ruin the Delta- period! And I am pretty sure you all know it.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Please refer to Impact REC-4 and 5 regarding impacts to fishing.
3077	2	Please reconsider this terrible idea and build much needed reservoirs and de-salination plants.	<p>It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California’s water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 (Demand Management) for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Rather, the scope and purpose of the proposed project is much more limited. As explained in Chapter 2 Project Objectives and Purpose and Need of the Final EIR/EIS, the fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the State Water Project (SWP) system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and Central Valley Project (CVP) south-of-Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework with statutory and contractual obligations.</p> <p>Additional water storage was eliminated from consideration in the Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS through the alternatives development and screening process (discussed in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives). As such, the proposed project does not propose storage as a project component. Although the proposed project would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, Alternative 4A is a stand-alone project which demonstrates independent utility just as future storage projects would demonstrate. Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives) and 37 (Storage) for additional information.</p> <p>Please also refer to Master Response 7 for additional information on why desalination was eliminated from the alternatives development and screening process.</p>
3077	3	Don't kill the look, history, wildlife, and fish of the Delta, turning this place into a waste land. We beg you!	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
3078	1	I believe the tunnel project will, ultimately, result in major harm to agriculture ,the ecology, boating, the economic health of the region, and the end of the Delta as we know it .	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.
3078	2	Instead of the tunnel project we need to spend the money on ways to increase the water available to the State.	Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including storm water drainage. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
3079	1	If water is diverted from the Delta, it will cause stagnation and allow the intrusion of salt water from the Bay. That would be deadly for fish, crops and our water supply.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
3080	1	We need more water storage and the tunnels will not produce a single drop of new water. They just move it from one place to another.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>Future reservoir projects are still undergoing evaluation or review, including potential surface water reservoir projects and groundwater storage projects. Therefore, potential storage projects are only considered in the EIR/S as cumulative impact projects (please see Master Response 37). It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p> <p>The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex 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).</p>
3081	1	The tunnel project is a destructive idea!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3082	1	One single man, Jerry Brown, should not try to fulfill his fathers' legacy! One man should	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		not dictate to the entire state. Put it to a vote - explanation mark!	
3083	1	The tunnel project is wrong and will ruin everything from farming to fishing.	<p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
3083	2	Let Los Angeles use their ocean for their water, they already take Colorado's' water. Fill your swimming pools with ocean water and build your salt stations for your drinking water. We need to be able to farm so you, my friends, can have food. Where the hell do you think it comes from?	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
3084	1	The tunnels will ruin where I live in Discovery Bay. Take away water from us and put a disgusting dump pile by my house.	<p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to with the goal of improving and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
3085	1	We do not need these tunnels. We have prime farming ground here that we need to continue to utilize. These tunnels will take vital farming land from families as well as harm the farming industry in the valley, which in turn will affect us all.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>Impacts to agriculture are identified and discussed in Chapter 14; Lead Agencies have proposed measures that would support and protect agricultural production in the Delta by securing agricultural easements and/or by seeking opportunities to protect and enhance agriculture with a focus on maintaining economic activity on agricultural lands. See Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation).</p>
3086	1	I want to protect the Delta's ecosystem.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3087	1	It should be criminal to do what the Governor is pushing. How can you possibly consider displacing 300 or more families, many of whom are farmers? Along with displacement of thousands of yards of dirt and sending water to Southern California- who does nothing to preserve it. We were fools to vote him back into office. Aren't his trains enough? Do not do this!	<p>Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3088	1	The Delta is already under attack by previous water exports. This will not fix California's water problems by stealing land and more water for big agriculture and Southern California. The money needs to be spent on current problems and future water conservation measures. Hell, start by requiring all new housing to have cisterns for outdoor irrigation and emergency drinking water for after a disaster.No tunnels. No killing of the Delta!	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. It is not the result of "favoring" large corporations (e.g., large agribusinesses). In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 34 for additional details on the determination of beneficial use, Master Response 35 regarding Southern California's water supply and Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.
3089	1	You can't water crops with salt water!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
3090	1	You can't water crops with salt water!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3091	1	I strongly oppose the tunnels as they will destroy our beautiful Delta and all of its many benefits to so many forms of life.	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. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
3092	1	I have a business and home in the Delta. It is very wrong to destroy the habitat with the infiltration of salt water to the area	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS.
3093	1	I'm tired of Southern California being given preferential treatment. I'm tired of seeing, what is notably desert, with communities of green yards. I've lived in both Northern and Southern parts of the state. I still have relatives living in South California. They fully understand the significance of the water grab and feel it's immoral, especially when it will destroy an unusual and important environmental area.	The commenter does not offer any evidence on how the project would result in significant environmental impacts related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3094	1	It is harmful to the Delta, an area where I live. And a waste of money. Our farmers need our water.	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.
3095	1	Stop this water grab!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environment impacts in the EIR/S were raised.
3096	1	I love our region. Let's put pressure on Southern California to implement desalination plants. No tunnels in our Delta.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
3097	1	I value what California has to offer. If these tunnels are built, with preposterous thought, our Delta will be destroyed and so will the lives of many hard working farmers whose families date back over a hundred years.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), and Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).
3098	1	One word 'desalination'.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
3099	1	The Delta is my home and it would break my heart to see it destroyed.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.