

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3100	1	These tunnels are a bad idea. Save our Delta and our water!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environment impacts in the EIR/S were raised.
3101	1	The tunnels will negatively impact 150-plus-year-old family farms in the Delta.	<p>Please see RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, Impact AG-1 and Impact AG-2 and their associated mitigation measures for complete analysis of how the proposed project will effect and mediate important farmland in the Delta.</p> <p>Please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input and impact far less agricultural land.</p>
3102	1	I live on the water in Discovery Bay and want to preserve our resources.	<p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
3103	1	I have lived in Stockton for most of my life. My father was a farmer and my mother was raised in the Delta. I know how important the Delta is to California and the nation. Farmers cannot raise food crops using salt water unless they farm seaweed.	<p>Effects of the alternatives on salinity levels are described in Chapter 8, Water Quality, and Appendix 8H, Electrical Conductivity, EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Modeling results indicate that the implementation of the water conveyance facilities may positively or adversely affect in-Delta water quality, depending on a number of factors including location, time of year, and hydrologic conditions. See tables in Appendices 8E through 8N for specific results related to various water quality constituents (including bromide and chloride).</p> <p>In addition to potential effects associated with the project and alternatives, modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the proposed project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 14, Water Quality, for more details regarding effects of the alternatives on salinity levels.</p>
3104	1	I grew up in the Delta, in Thornton and Fairfield, California and I believe removing more water from the Delta would be detrimental to not only the wildlife that depend on fresh, clean water but to the quality of life of all of us living in Northern California.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (Changes in Delta Exports).
3105	1	I believe the tunnels would be a costly, senseless mistake that would ruin our Delta and adversely affect us all! I would protest in person but unfortunately I can't afford to take time off from work	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3106	1	I'm against this power grab for water that works to the detriment of farmers and creates unprofitable labor expense at its' source.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water) and Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation).</p>
3107	1	I'm from Walnut Creek back when salmon used to come up Walnut Creek and lay their eggs and reproduce. Look what has happen since the late forties. The creek has been cemented over wiping out any chance of a comeback for all the fish species and turtles who lived in and around the creek. What would happen to the Delta if more water is drawn away from this jewel of California? Countless birds, geese and waterfowl depend upon this area for their live or does this not matter? Think again unless you want Walnut Creek repeated again? The Northwest depends on this region as it is too!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3108	1	The tunnels are a huge mistake by a Governor who has "Tunnel Vision". We need dams and reservoirs and a plan for the wet years.	For information regarding why water storage was not included in the proposed project, refer to Master Response 37 (Water Storage) and Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS. 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.
3109	1	The tunnels will destroy the Delta and devastate the farmlands.	Please see RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, Impact AG-1 and Impact AG-2 and their associated mitigation measures for complete analysis of how the proposed project will effect and mediate important farmland in the Delta.
3111	1	The tunnels will irreversibly damage the Delta Wetlands. Use the money to build/expand dams.	<p>While water storage is a critically important tool for managing California's water resources, it is not a topic that must be addressed in the EIR/EIS for the proposed project. This is because the proposed project does not, and need 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 purposes of CEQA and NEPA, just as future storage projects would be. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the development of alternatives. Please see Master Response 6 for information on Demand Management.</p>
3112	1	Stop taking our precious water. We don't even have enough for ourselves.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environment impacts in the EIR/S were raised.
3113	1	These tunnels will not fix the problem. Dredge the Delta then reinforce the levees instead.	Please refer to Appendix 6A for information on why levee improvements are not part 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.
3114	1	I don't agree with destroying the Delta for 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.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3115	1	Water theft has always been a terrible crime with heavy penalties. Once again the greedy Agriculture and Southern California interests are trying to devastate the ecology and economy of our precious San Francisco Bay and Northern California River Delta system. Shame. Look to population control and conservation first-- use your own resources first, not ours!	<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>
3116	1	I opposed the Peripheral Canal and I think the tunnels will decimate the Delta!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3117	1	Southern California can sip from the Pacific. Why take from Northern California? We've been through this before with the Peripheral Canal crap decades earlier.	It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented California WaterFix project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Please see Master Response 26 for additional information on effects on northern California. Please also refer to Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply), 52 (Peripheral Canal), 61 (Tunnel Option), and 63 (Desalination).
3118	1	The Sacramento Delta is a vital natural resource and should not be destroyed to provide cheap drinking water for people hundreds of miles away. It is time to build more storage capacity, rather than transport capacity!	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 37 (Storage).
3119	1	I worry about salt water intrusion. I think that it is outrageous to take some of California's best farmland to build tunnels. .Nature has built a complex ecosystem that we should leave in good health. Cost benefits are not there.	<p>Salinity in the Delta is a function of the amount and timing of freshwater input from the major tributaries, tidal action from San Francisco Bay, and exports from the Delta. During the late winter and spring months of seasonally elevated flows, and in wet years, seawater intrusion is limited and the Delta has mostly low salinity. During low-flow summer and fall months, and during dry years, lower freshwater flows result in greater amounts of seawater intrusion. Staff from DWR and USBR constantly monitor Delta water quality conditions and adjust operations of the SWP and CVP in real time as necessary to meet water quality objectives set by the State Water Resource Control Board protection of agricultural water supply, municipal and industrial drinking water supply, and fish and wildlife beneficial uses. See section 4.3.4 for a discussion on the proposed projects effects on water quality, salinity and electrical conductivity.</p> <p>Effects of the alternatives on salinity levels are described in Chapter 8, Water Quality, and Appendix 8H, Electrical Conductivity, EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Modeling results indicate that the implementation of the water conveyance facilities may positively or adversely affect in-Delta water quality, depending on a number of factors including location, time of year, and hydrologic conditions. See tables in Appendices 8E through 8N for specific results related to various water quality constituents (including bromide and chloride).</p> <p>In addition to potential effects associated with the project and alternatives, modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the proposed project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			water further into the Delta than occurs at present.
3120	1	You are heading down a path that is not in sync with the region's requirements for a sustainable Delta that will serve all of California, not just the giant corporate agribusiness interests. No more water will flow south after you spend billions of dollars and further upset the balance of nature. Stop the tunnels now.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3121	1	I do not want the Delta to be ruined. I don't want my grandparents, aunts, uncles, cousins, and friends evicted from their homes. I don't want my friends to lose their businesses. I'm not willing to let the people I love suffer because of tunnels that California doesn't need. The tunnels are not a solution to our water problems.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. The preferred alternative, 4A, would displace 17 residential structures. When required, the project proponents would provide compensation to property owners for losses due to implementation of the alternative.
3122	1	We need practical water policy for the 21st century, not a pie-in-the-sky plan to prolong our 19th century water rights wars.	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.
3123	1	I believe this is a colossal mistake on so many levels for our state -- financial, environmental. There are simpler ways to solve our water problems.	<p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
3124	1	I support our local farms and the Delta. Keep the water here in our local area. It isn't our fault that Southern California is so irresponsible.	The Lead Agencies discuss of community character in Chapter 16 of the EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A (Socioeconomics) identifies the unique features of the Delta and describes the potential effects on Delta communities. Please see chapter 15 for a discussion on impacts to recreation. Impacts to agriculture are identified and discussed in Chapter 14; project proponents have proposed measures that would support and protect agricultural production in the Delta by securing agricultural easements and/or by seeking opportunities to protect and enhance agriculture with a focus on maintaining economic activity on agricultural lands. Please see Master Response 18 for more information on agricultural mitigation.
3125	1	I live in the Delta and want to protect my business, my family and my way of life!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3126	1	The current plan calls for bulldozing my family home, destroying half of my hometown, and ruining thousands of acres of fertile farmland, as well as threatening the entire Delta with saltwater intrusion. All for a gift from the governor to Big Agriculture in the Central Valley so they can keep wasting it. In the middle of the worst drought in our history.	<p>Socioeconomic effects (e.g., acquiring property) of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS. A Draft Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the proposed project would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California.</p> <p>When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the proposed project. Construction of water conveyance facilities would be sequenced over approximately 10 years. All impacts would be minimized and mitigated to the degree feasible and are described under each alternative in the RDEIR/SDEIS individual resource chapters and in Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, EIR/EIS. An analysis of economic impacts of the proposed project, including impacts related to agriculture are also evaluated and described in the Statewide Economic Impact Report (http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/Draft_BDCP_Statewide_Econo</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			mic_Impact_Report_8-5-13.sflb.ashx).
3127	1	I am a Delta boater [and] am concerned that the tunnels will ruin the environment. Wildlife will be displaced for the benefit of big-time agriculture interests.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
3128	1	The California Delta is a unique place which must be preserved. As the largest estuary on the West Coast it supports a diversity of life which will be irreversibly damaged by the reduction of fresh water into the natural balance of the ecosystem.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3129	1	I live on the Delta. I care about our ecosystem. Once destroyed, it will never be the same again. Please make reservoirs, or other ways to save water. Save our Delta for future generations!	<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 24 (Delta As A Place).</p>
3130	1	I want to protect the Sacramento Delta ecosystem for fish & wildlife, local agriculture and recreational enjoyment!	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</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>
3131	1	I am 100% opposed to the tunnels. We need to preserve our Delta which is a treasure. It is also such a waste of money that could be used elsewhere so much more effectively.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
3132	1	No tunnels; they make no sense, create no water!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environment impacts in the EIR/S were raised.
3133	1	This is an outrageous rip-off of the California taxpayers to transfer senior water rights to Jerry Brown's corporate farm campaign contributors, with no benefits to, or financial protection for, the public who is expected to pay for this.	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.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Please refer to Master Response 5.
3134	1	The Delta is a priceless wetland, and its destruction via the tunnels would be deadly to wildlife already in crisis. Such a move would be extremely shortsighted and would not solve water issues long term. I believe we should control the urge to just do something especially if it's wrong, and resolve to be wise and wonderful instead.	<p>Since the late 1800s, the Bay-Delta ecosystem has been substantially altered. Changes in key environmental attributes of the Bay-Delta have contributed to the current degraded state of the ecosystem and appear to be proximate causes of declines in desired fishes and increases in non-native species. California WaterFix is not intended to address all the factors that have contributed to the Delta's decline and briefly summarizes a few but not all of those factors. Many factors that have contributed to the decline of the Delta's ecosystem including the conversion of tidal marsh and floodplains to farmland, construction of levees and altering of tide flows, in-Delta and upstream water diversions, contaminant discharges, ammonia and nutrient discharges and changes to the food web, increases in water temperatures, and introduction of non-native and invasive species. The Delta will remain in a highly altered state for the foreseeable future and the project is not intended to address all the past harms or restore the Delta to a pre-altered state.</p> <p>The project was initiated by former Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, who was twice elected by a majority of California voters. The process has continued under the administration of his successor, Edmund G. Brown, Jr. Hence, the project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole. 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>It is important to note, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Responses 4 (Alternatives), Master Response 31 (Delta Reform Act), and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) for the development of and selection of the proposed project alternatives since 2006.</p>
3135	1	I lived in Walnut Creek, California when the creek supported wild salmon and trout, yes it did. But along came man, cemented over the creek, killing any chance of recovery for all fish and turtles and for the way of life for the people and animals. Do not destroy Gods' creation. The Delta is a one of kind ecosystem never to be replaced. Get rid of the Governor, send him down the river!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3136	1	The Delta is so important to our Central Valley. Southern California needs to get water elsewhere! Try desalination maybe!	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
3137	1	I was raised on the Delta. There are so many cities out here that depend on these waters for survival. I fear taking the little water we do have would kill the small farm towns that rely so much on it.	By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. The proposed project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 24 (Changes in Delta Exports). Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).
3138	1	This plan is a boondoggle with no redeeming value.	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. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.
3139	1	We need to stop all the agriculture business millionaires that want to steal more water for crops in the very arid desert down south. The Delta is already stressed to the limit and this Mr. Brown thinks we're all stupid to believe that taking more water will save it. Stop the Peripheral Canal "Tunnels"!	<p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The 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>
3140	1	We lived on Bethel Island for 27 years and want to protect the ecosystem. It's a place that can't be replaced and it has so much history.	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 with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
3141	1	I am against the tunnels. The Delta is in trouble. The tunnels will kill the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3142	1	We're in a drought Californians! Having this Tunnel doesn't mean we're going to have water to transport to Southern California. Our money is better spent on how to conserve water for future droughts! Where the (expletive deleted) are we going to get the water to send down south? Common sense people. Common sense.	<p>As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 5.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3143	1	The tunnel proposal is too expensive, will ruin the ecology of the Delta and misuses the practice of eminent domain. Where is the environmental document for this project?	DWR acknowledges your opposition to the project. The environmental impacts of the Proposed Action and alternatives are documented in the Public Draft EIR/EIS released in December 2013 and the RDEIR/SDEIS released in July 2015.
3144	1	I am sick and tired of my government making laws and policies that only benefit millionaires and big corporations, when my government should be making laws and policies that benefit the mass population. These tunnels do not benefit the mass population but instead they benefit big corporations and millionaires. No tunnels.	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. Please also refer to Master Response 5 regarding costs and funding.</p>
3145	1	I feel we need to protect the Delta water ways for our farmers, environment and our tourism. If we let Governor Brown succeed in getting the tunnels built hundreds of multi-generational family farms will be destroyed. These are sustainable farms, unlike the desert farming that the Delta will be drained to water. It's not a good plan to spend millions to destroy a stable environment for one that cannot be made into a sustainable one.	Please refer to Master Response 18 for more information regarding agricultural impact mitigation. Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
3146	1	We need to save our Delta waters, not destroy them. We do not need to support almond farmers that export more than 75% of the almonds out of our country. Save the Delta, not the almond farmers that are getting rich off of our water.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). The proposed project would not increase the amount of water to which SWP and CVP hold water rights for use allowed under their contracts and permits and approvals for refuge water supplies or other environmental purposes.</p>
3147	1	The San Joaquin Delta is California's single most essential resource. Priority #1.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3148	1	The tunnels will decimate a vital ecosystem and economy.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).
3149	1	The tunnel project would be devastating to California and the ecosystem of the Delta. It would harm wildlife.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3150	1	It is a waste of taxpayers' money.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3151	1	Me and my wife will be one of the many that will lose our home to these tunnels. Stop the Tunnels so we can live the rest of our life in peace.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. The preferred alternative, 4A, would displace 17 residential structures. When required, the project proponents would provide compensation to property owners for losses due to implementation of the alternative.
3152	1	The state should find other means of distributing water. Tunnels will destroy the habitat and community.	<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>
3153	1	Taking water from an estuary that supports an ecosystem of flora, fauna, and people is wrong. Robbing an entire community of their water to support farmers who chose to farm arid areas is wrong. Spending billions on a plan that is destructive on every level is wrong! Do the right thing protecting the Bay/Delta estuary by opposing the tunnel project. This is our home.	<p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p>
3154	1	I objected to these Tunnels from the beginning. We were not told the truth. We are killing California. I have watched our state slowly being sucked dry for my whole life. At what point do we stop the greed for more water?	<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 proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.</p> <p>The Proposed Project 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). These actions are being considered to meet future water</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>demands for planned municipal uses consistent with water demand projections in the recent Urban Water Management Plans submitted to DWR which include approaches to meet the 20 percent reduction per capita urban water use by 2020.</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>
3155	1	I cherish the Delta and its' lifestyle. All must show that they can ration and manage water before they are handed more. Jerry Brown, this is your father's issue. Please grow balls and stop selling Northern California out to Southern California.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3156	1	We need water storage not these money wasting, land grabbing tunnels!	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 surface water and groundwater 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).
3157	1	I live on the Delta and have seen it become more polluted from algae and lack of out flow.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
3158	1	The Delta is too important to play games with.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3159	1	I don't believe diverting water from the Delta is the best thing to do for the preservation of the Delta!	<p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).</p>
3160	1	I am fundamentally against shipping our water to Southern California due to the lack of conservation effort on their part. When I see people washing down their driveways when I am conserving like crazy, it does not inspire me to give them more water to waste. They need to learn how to take care of their natural resources and fend for themselves.	<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. The State Water Resources Control Board, not DWR and Reclamation, is responsible for decisions relating to water rights. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.</p> <p>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. Overall, the average annual Delta exports are less in</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Alternatives 2, 4 (H2, H3, H4), and 5 through 9 than under Existing Conditions, as shown in Figure 5-17 of Chapter 5, Water Supply, of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).</p>
3161	1	As a life-long resident of the San Francisco Bay-Delta Estuary, I believe there are far better ways to conserve and build sustainability in the California water supply than building massive tunnels that will destroy the Delta.	<p>As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.</p> <p>The proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months and in drier years; and increase exports in the wet winter months in wetter years when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management). These actions are being considered to meet future water demands for planned municipal uses consistent with water demand projections in the recent Urban Water Management Plans submitted to DWR which include approaches to meet the 20 percent per capita urban water use by 2020.</p>
3162	1	I believe that the Delta should stay the same for future generations of salmon and people. The tunnels will kill the Delta by diverting all the Sacramento River, the tunnels are being build large enough to divert the entire river. This will be an irreversible water tragedy affecting our air and food sources and clean water!	<p>As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal and State regulating agencies, ESA compliance, and project design. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3163	1	I believe this would pose a threat to public health.	Please see Chapter 25, Public Health, for the impact analysis related to the potential impacts on public health resulting from implementation of the action alternatives.
3164	1	I'm blown away that a 70 year old idea proven disastrous for the Delta, the SF Bay, and the San Joaquin Valley gets so much traction based on having been a Pat Brown idea. We have new accurate information and know better!! Let's axe this expensive, debilitating project now, and restore the Delta for less money with fruitful benefits for farmers, fishermen, all of us who drink water and eat food, and the wildlife in the Delta. Time we wake up to 2015!	<p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
3165	1	Keep the water in Northern California.	<p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).</p>
3166	1	<p>Northern California water is needed for our mountains, forests and wetlands. Our wildlife depend on natural tributaries carrying water through the State. Southern California has insufficient storage capacity. Southern California is taking too much water. Northern California is being sucked dry and set up to be tinder for wildfires by the Tunnels. Stop the Tunnels</p> <p>Save our Delta now!</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. 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. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.</p> <p>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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods.</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>
3167	1	It is important to keep the fresh water in our rivers and bay.	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
3168	1	It's moronic to dig under the fragile Delta.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3168	2	Idiotic move to take more water away when "they" already have put one rock barrier above Antioch. Salt water is already here!	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.
3169	1	The Tunnels Project is bad for the Delta and bad for California. I have yet to see how this could possibly help any of the concerns Governor Brown claims it addresses. #notunnels #restorethedelta #iamrestorethedelta	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3170	1	Messing with the Delta life, and thus the water, is wrong. Too many things that are great about the Bay Area depend on leaving the Delta as it is. Please . . . no tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3171	1	I oppose the Delta tunnels and can't believe they are still moving forward after all the negative research. Weren't they turned down by voters years ago?	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.
3172	1	I means life for our Delta! No tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3173	1	This [WaterFix project] will hurt many farmers [and] will not be beneficial to our state. It will ruin our land.	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.
3174	1	The tunnels are more of the same exploitive actions that contributed to turning California from a Mediterranean sanctuary into a desert. Except these tunnels are cannibalizing on an already depleted environment and resource and for an obscene amount of money.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 24 (Changes in Delta Exports). Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
3174	2	<p>There are other options! Look at Sun Valley, California; don't centralize, localize! Focus on the micro instead of the macro!</p> <p>Permaculture outlines these methods perfectly and for a fraction of the cost. Get with the times this isn't the gold rush era.</p>	The commenter does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3174	3	It's pathetic, I met an environmental scientist from Edmonton, Canada, an area with flat wetlands similar to ours. She said they're studying California for what not to do. The tunnels are another fine example of just that, what not to do.	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.
3175	1	Even if the Delta were not the recreational site it is, I would oppose any plan that diverts water from an area of severe drought to any other area, whether it is experiencing drought or not. It's the ecological equivalent of robbing Peter to pay Paul.	<p>As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.</p> <p>The proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months and in drier years; and increase exports in the wet winter months in wetter years when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management). These actions are being considered to meet future water demands for planned municipal uses consistent with water demand projections in the recent Urban Water Management Plans submitted to DWR which include approaches to meet the 20 percent per capita urban water use by 2020.</p>
3176	1	We citizens oppose the tunnels. Respect our voice of no and respect our Delta ecology.	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.
3177	1	The Delta is a very special ecosystem and I don't want to see it destroyed.	<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>
3178	1	I'm in support of Mother Nature and I sign this petition as a Native Hawaiian Kanaka Maoli in the name of Mauna A Wakea.	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.
3179	1	I live on the Delta. There is too much at stake with this project. Our Delta ecosystem is important and already strained. Protecting this environment is important.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			were raised.
3180	1	The Delta is a precious water resource. We enjoy it recreationally and rely on the food production.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3180	2	Why any sane person would want to steal land and affect the livelihood of so many for a few political interests is beyond me. How would the Governor and cronies feel if they had to give up their front lawns so some in the north could expand their lawns? It is so unfair and so against the American way. This is Robin Hood in reverse. The rich are stealing from the poor . . . Oh yes, that has been going on for some time, hasn't it? It's time to stop. Big business is not the only business that matters.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3180	3	I worry about what is being done to the ecosystem. This will do irreparable damage.	<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>
3181	1	There is no coming back from an irresponsible action such as this, and the proof lies in the same area where these tunnels will deliver the precious water needed for the Delta. If they had built dams in the canyons instead of million-dollar homes they would have water.	<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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			exported supplies. The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change with continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).
3182	1	I believe the tunnel system is not the right way to handle the water crises down south. We need water here as well! Don't take what is ours!	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.
3183	1	I support clean and protected waters. For environmental, public health and economic concerns.	<p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
3184	1	I oppose sending our water elsewhere. We need it for our environment. Our ecosystem, our farmers, our well drinking water. Why do you need to put [it] in jeopardy? This only creates more problems.	For a discussion of purpose and need of the California WaterFix, please refer to Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need.
3185	1	We need more water storage and secondary water systems for non-potable irrigation. We don't need more water sent 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.
3186	1	The Delta and it's habitat have to be preserved! It can't be destroyed.	<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>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3187	1	The salt water intrusion into the Delta is already bad for the environment and the local agriculture. The tunnels will destroy what is left.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
3188	1	This is just another Southern California water grab. Let's get busy storing water and not shipping it across the state.	Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.
3189	1	We need to manage and conserve our water, not steal from each other.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3190	1	I want to live in a healthy state, and for my children to have the same outdoor opportunities as I have had.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3191	1	The tunnel does not benefit the Delta. We can do better in developing a water delivery plan for the entire state!	<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.</p> <p>It is important to note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p>
3192	1	The Delta tunnel project will ruin the Delta and not solve our long-term water issues. It will only line the pockets of Governor Davis [sic] and his cronies.	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).
3193	1	I do not want to see family [memories] stripped or the businesses lost.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. Please refer to Impact ECON-1, 5, 6, and 7 under Alternative 4A in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, for discussions of impacts related to economics.
3194	1	There is not enough water in the Sacramento [River] now, let alone taking more for Central Valley agriculture.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation would be able to pump from the proposed north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design. 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>when endangered and threatened fish species are present within the north Delta facilities area. The intake fish screens drive the overall size of the intake structure on the riverbank, and have been numbered and sized to permit water to flow through the screens within a predetermined flow regime set by California Department of Fish and Wildlife and NMFS fish screen criteria.</p> <p>The proposed project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the proposed project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative. It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under the proposed project as compared to exports under No Action Alternative based on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. Although long-term total exports under the proposed project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p>
3195	1	I want to preserve our Delta as it is.	<p>Since the late 1800s, the Bay-Delta ecosystem has been substantially altered. Changes in key environmental attributes of the Bay-Delta have contributed to the current degraded state of the ecosystem and appear to be proximate causes of declines in desired fishes and increases in non-native species. California Waterfix is not intended to address all the factors that have contributed to the Delta's decline and briefly summarizes a few but not all of those factors. Many factors that have contributed to the decline of the Delta's ecosystem including the conversion of tidal marsh and floodplains to farmland, construction of levees and altering of tide flows, in-Delta and upstream water diversions, contaminant discharges, ammonia and nutrient discharges and changes to the food web, increases in water temperatures, and introduction of non-native and invasive species. The Delta will remain in a highly altered state for the foreseeable future and the project is not intended to address all the past harms or restore the Delta to a pre-altered state.</p> <p>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>
3196	1	It's all wrong! It's going to suck us dry! Will be catching stingray from Rio Vista!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environment impacts in the EIR/S were raised.
3197	1	I don't want to see the beautiful environment and surrounding ecosystems of the Delta ruined by the tunnels. We have to take value in what makes our area a special place to live and protect it.	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.
3198	1	These tunnels will have the capacity to completely stop the flow of the Sacramento River just south of Freeport. Southern Californian interests have already stopped the San Joaquin River and destroyed one of the world's best salmon hatcheries. We won't let them do the same to the Sacramento River and the downstream environment!	<p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> <p>The San Joaquin River is being restored independent of the BDCP, so that its historic fisheries can be revived. Although the flows will not equal those that occurred prior to the construction of Friant Dam north of Fresno, the new flows under the San Joaquin River Restoration Program will represent a huge ecological improvement over conditions that have persisted over the last several decades.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3199	1	This will destroy the livelihood of many families. It will not produce more water; it will just add to the pockets of Resnick, Brown and Feinstein.	<p>Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
3200	1	This is too important to sit on the sidelines. The power grab here is ridiculous! Everyone but the Governor and his cronies have acknowledged what a bad idea this is. This must be stopped! It is a waste of resources on many levels.	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>
3201	1	Not one thing about the tunnels creates any more water. We can't trust our state officials to keep their promise not to over-pump the Delta.	<p>As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. 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 Decisions, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management). These actions are being considered to meet future water demands for planned municipal uses consistent with water demand projections in the recent Urban Water Management Plans submitted to DWR which include approaches to meet the 20 percent reduction per capita urban water use by 2020.</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>
3202	1	Los Angeles has grown so large and needs water. If they move forward with this plan it will decimate a way of life. Another way must be found.	<p>As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service,</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management). These actions are being considered to meet future water demands for planned municipal uses consistent with water demand projections in the recent Urban Water Management Plans submitted to DWR which include approaches to meet the 20 percent reduction per capita urban water use by 2020.</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>
3203	1	Worried about the habitat and salt intrusion problems.	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.
3204	1	My son and his family live in Hood, California. This (putting in tunnels) would devastate the town and many parts of the beautiful Delta.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3205	1	I grew up here and my family lives here. I don't want to see them have to leave their homes because of this.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. The preferred alternative, 4A, would displace 17 residential structures. When required, the project proponents would provide compensation to property owners for losses due to implementation of the alternative.
3206	1	All the headwaters are going dry! It will kill Northern rivers to keep sucking water out to transport south. This is end game: we must create a new water plan. Conserve, reuse recycle. Water is the new gold!	Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 34 for additional details on the determination of beneficial use.
3207	1	I can't figure out who this plan benefits other than large-scale farms with water intensive crops. No locals or environmental groups think they're a good idea. I support the people who live there and are opposed, they have a greater right to keep their environment protected over farms that really should have considered our state's drought history before investing so much money.	The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry.
3208	1	Tunnels will doom the California Delta.	Since the late 1800s, the Bay-Delta ecosystem has been substantially altered. Changes in key environmental attributes of the Bay-Delta have contributed to the current degraded state of the ecosystem and appear to be proximate causes of declines in desired fishes and increases in non-native species. California WaterFix is not intended to address all the factors that have contributed to the Delta's decline and briefly summarizes a few but not all of those factors. Many factors that have contributed to the decline of the Delta's ecosystem including the conversion of tidal marsh and floodplains to farmland, construction of levees and altering of tide flows, in-Delta and upstream water diversions, contaminant discharges, ammonia and nutrient

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			discharges and changes to the food web, increases in water temperatures, and introduction of non-native and invasive species. The Delta will remain in a highly altered state for the foreseeable future and the project is not intended to address all the past harms or restore the Delta to a pre-altered state. Please refer to Master Response 4 (Tunnel Option), which addresses why the tunnel option was the only alternative optimized.
3209	1	It's not right for the Delta! Save the Delta!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3210	1	This is a poorly planned waste of money, as was the failed Peripheral Canal.	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. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.
3211	1	It is just wrong! For less money you can build desalination plants in the southland without turning Northern California into a desert and bring salt water into my drinking 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/EIS.
3212	1	My family has been farming in the Delta for close to 150 years. The tunnels would ruin their ability to farm on fertile land, and send the water to expand farming on unsustainable desert land. It's taking water from farmers with a higher legal priority to the water, and giving it to those with a lower priority, while at the same time putting a huge financial burden on all of California. Tome, this is clearly wrong.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies. The proposed project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the proposed project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative. It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under the proposed project as compared to exports under No Action Alternative based on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. Although long-term total exports under the proposed project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.
3213	1	I am an angler who fishes the Delta on a regular basis. The planned destructive tunnels would cause irreparable harm to the vast ecosystem that is the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (aka the California Delta).	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.
3214	1	The tunnels are a horrible idea that do nothing to fix California 's water issues while destroying one of our greatest natural resources.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.</p> <p>Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods.</p>
3215	1	This is bull [expletive deleted]. You're ruining the Delta for money.	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.
3216	1	I believe that they are detrimental to the California Delta and my property values. We need to find a better solution. You are hurting some for the benefit of others. Not good.	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).
3217	1	The whole project is a boondoggle, both economically and environmentally and will literally destroy the Sacramento River Delta as we know it. I lived in Walnut Grove for 44 years and still have farming property there. Browns' whole idea is a 'pipedream', if you will excuse the pun. It really is a joke. How it has gotten this far is beyond most Deltans. It must not get permitted. The end cost would be astronomical with all the inevitable over-runs.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place), and Master Response 5 (Cost).
3218	1	I signed because I love our Delta! And it would be a shame and heart breaking to have this happen!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3219	1	The process is corrupt. Interests are being served that don't reflect what the people want, or even what people need.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3220	1	I'm a Northern Californian who loves the Delta and want to see it protected.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3221	1	The Sacramento River Delta has been producing fruits, veggies and more for more than 150 years. It is necessary to sustain our food supply plus boating recreation. We must preserve our Sacramento Delta. Also, more than 300 farms that have been in operation for more than 150 years would be taken through eminent domain by the state of California. The Delta is rich with natural resources and California history. Stop the tunnels now!	<p>The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor include any regulatory actions that would affect water rights holders other than DWR, Reclamation, and SWP and CVP contractors.</p> <p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via proposed conveyance facilities.
3222	1	I agree with "Restore the Delta, Stop the tunnels!" This is a water grab for the rich! It makes no sense to send our water from a fragile Delta inland estuary to Southern California for water guzzling nut trees, planted in the last decade knowing full well they were going to need our Delta water!! These same Mega farmers are sucking our aquifers dry, causing permanent damage to future underground water storage! It's insanity! Taking water from a natural perfectly suited growing area, which is North Central California and sending it to be wasted in a polluted Southern California desert!	<p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The 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>
3223	1	I care about preserving the Delta ecosystem as a fishery and believe that the water should serve regional agriculture and not diverted to big Agriculture desert watering or residential growth in areas where it cannot be reasonably supported by local resources.	<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. 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>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>
3224	1	Los Angeles, as a biome, was never meant to support so many people.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3225	1	These tunnels will not produce any more water. All you are doing is catering to the big water grabbers who continue to plant in a desert.	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Origin laws and requirements. Senior water rights holders are not affected by implementation of action alternatives. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation would be able to pump from the proposed north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the proposed project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S.
3226	1	We need to protect are our farm land, waterfowl fish etc... Not to mention the beauty of this area, our Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3227	1	This measure will adversely affect our immediate future, and the future of our children and grandchildren! Please stop Brown's special interest madness!	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
3228	1	It's a crazy idea just like the bullet train.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3229	1	Bad, expensive plan that will exploit the Delta for its water. Really is just a water grab for big business. Do not ruin Northern California's Delta for profit off taxpayer money.	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. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.
3230	1	The tunnels are in conflict with the natural order. We are concerned with Global Warming yet we want to send water to a desert! Make Southern California build more reservoirs!	Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management and Master Response 35 regarding Southern California's water supply. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.
3231	1	It is a stupid idea.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3232	1	I do not agree with the tunnel plan. It is not good for the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3233	1	The tunnels will do nothing to improve the environmental needs of the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3234	1	I believe that this project is an incredible waste of resources of all kinds and will do extensive damage to the environment.	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.
3235	1	I am from a fifth generation farming family raised in the Delta. I oppose Governor	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Brown's tunnel project.	
3236	1	Let Southern California save water and get their water somewhere else.	<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. The State Water Resources Control Board, not DWR and Reclamation, is responsible for decisions relating to water rights. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.</p> <p>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.</p>
3237	1	Will ruin the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3238	1	I think this is very wrong. The water grab is BS.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3239	1	I live in and love the Delta and corrupt money guzzling losers want to steal it from us!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3240	1	I want our farmers to have water for their fields. This will not solve our water problem. We need it here!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. Senior water rights holders are not affected by implementation of action alternatives. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation would be able to pump from the proposed north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the proposed project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S.
3241	1	My family is 5th generation farmers in the Delta. Putting in these tunnels would ruin our livelihood, not just our land!	<p>Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.</p> <p>As described in Impact ECON-6 under Alternative 4A in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, construction of conveyance facilities would convert land from existing agricultural uses to project-related construction uses, and agricultural land could also be affected by changes in water quality and other conditions that would affect crop productivity. These direct effects on agricultural land are described under Impacts AG-1 and AG-2 in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources. Total value of irrigated crop production in the Delta would decline on average by \$5.3 million per year during the construction period, with total irrigated crop acreage declining by about 4,700 acres. Other effects related to production costs, travel time, and loss of investments in production facilities and standing orchards and vineyards would also occur as a result of facilities construction. When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the alternative.</p>
3242	1	I am completely opposed to the tunnels. I think it is destructive and reckless. I support Restore the Delta and their fight to stop the tunnels!	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			operational flexibility.
3243	1	Healthy ecology is required for long term healthy economy.	<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.</p>
3244	1	We need an overhaul of water policy to focus efforts on conservation. Sending more water south does not serve conservation efforts and could do great environmental harm.	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.
3245	1	It is not right to destroy another ecosystem, family livelihoods, and local economy and still not solve any water problems for anybody. Find water somewhere else.	As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.
3246	1	I believe these tunnels will not bring anything positive to the locals. I love this area and drive it because of its beauty. How is it okay to take land from these locals and use it for your own purposes that are not proven to help them? It is not!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any specific issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS. Regarding positive effects on for locals, the project intends to improve ecosystem conditions for fish and aquatic resources through flexible operation of the north and south intakes.
3247	1	Let Southern California build its own reservoirs. They have enough money. Our ground is already sinking. A lot of resorts depend on the river and fishing to make a living just say No. Don't fool with Mother Nature.	<p>The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of a particular water supply augmentation approach (more storage in Southern California) and does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>While water storage is a critically important tool for managing California's water resources, it is not a topic that must be addressed in the EIR/EIS for the proposed project. This is because the proposed project does not, and need 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 purposes of CEQA and NEPA, just as future storage projects would be. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, of the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage. Please see Master Response 37 regarding water storage.</p>
3248	1	The Delta ecosystem is beautiful and delicate. Please don't ruin it.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3249	1	I grew up going to the Delta, please save out Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3250	1	I'm tired of all these money grabs labeled as something else at everyone else's expense. Stop this now!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3251	1	I love the Delta! I love the way of life that exists there and want it to continue to be fruitful!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3252	1	Instead of building tunnels to transport water, we should build reservoirs to store the water we have. That's like trying to deposit a paycheck in a bank account before you actually receive the paycheck.	Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.
3253	1	Taking more water from the Delta won't heal or restore the Delta. I have concerns about who will actually pay for the tunnels. I don't want taxpayers like myself holding the bag for billions.	Please refer to Master Response 5 regarding costs of implementation, and 39 for more information regarding funding for the BDCP. Please also refer to Master Response 3, Purpose and Need.
3254	1	This tunnel is so expensive and worthless to Californians. I say take that money that is to be spent on the tunnels and use it to build a desalination plant!	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
3255	1	Having spent most of my life visiting the Delta as a child with my grandparents and parents, I distinctly remember being told by my grandfather to "throw back" the 30 lb., striped bass, which were easy and very common to catch, as they were "too small" and needed to go back and "grow up and make "baby fish" for "later". When in the last 10 years has that been a common statement? And all of us that live in and around the Delta know why! When the 5th pump went on, to feed the ridiculous "desert" trees that were never supposed to be planted, we here knew that the Delta was going to crash. And it has crashed! To further decimate our unique eco-system, one of the very few in the world, by these stupid proposed tunnels is unforgivable when real science, not political paybacks, show that these tunnels will destroy what is left! Not only for fisherman, who support so many small businesses, but for our farmers in the Delta as well, this is beyond deplorable and cannot happen.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the Clean Water Act and federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. 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.
3256	1	I don't want to see a world where water is only for the rich and corporate. If the tunnels are built the sixth mass extinction includes California's contribution of 750 plant and animal species within the largest set of waterways along the West Coast of the Americas. I want to see a world where we protect and steward these precious life-giving places. In the middle of this drought, we need to care about the rivers that sustain us- and stop them from being ravaged for profit.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. 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, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. Effects on fish and wildlife will be avoided, minimized, and mitigated.
3257	1	I live in Discovery Bay - I know the value of the water to our community, whether for our recreational waterways or for agriculture. I've seen the damage pumping out our water is doing - it belongs here. It is vital, environmentally more than anything, that	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		you do not build these tunnels.	<p>Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Deliveries to in-Delta senior water rights users are the same under the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and all action alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS in accordance with existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements.</p> <p>Considerations of adverse impacts to agricultural water users due to implementation of the action alternatives (not climate change, sea level rise, or projected population growth that would have occurred with or without the proposed project) are discussed in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources. Changes in Delta water quality that could affect agricultural water users are discussed in Chapter 8, Water Quality, including changes in bromide, chloride, and electrical conductivity. As discussed in Chapter 15, Recreation, the action alternatives are not expected to result in a substantial decrease or increase in Delta surface water levels to an extent that would affect recreational activities.</p>
3258	1	I strongly oppose this tunnel going through (basically our home). Just so Jerry Brown can benefit, that's some b.s. This is our home, our community, families, our children would be greatly affected. Do not put a tunnel through our community!	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
3259	1	This would be a disaster to the ecosystem and our community. Southern Californians need to better reserve water and not waste it.	<p>As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).</p>
3260	1	I live here and this is not a good idea. We need the water here up in Northern California for our crops. We are basically the produce capitol of California. Wildlife and marine life depend on the water here without interruption. Stop! Stop the tunnels! Find another way!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. Senior water rights holders are not affected by implementation of action alternatives. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation would be able to pump from the proposed north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the proposed project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S.
3261	1	The tunnels will forever ruin the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3262	1	I believe this project is aimed at increasing new home building in Southern California at the expense of Northern California.	The comment raises import policy issues concerning sustainable growth and available water supplies in California. However, the comment does not question the growth inducement analysis or conclusions of Chapter 30.
3263	1	This tunnel project not only destroys the land but it's like taking the life of the people there. We are all equal and access to clean water is for all.	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).
3264	1	This is not ok!!! Stop the tunnels!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3265	1	I want to protect the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3266	1	My family lives in the Delta and I hold many numerous holiday celebrations there. It's something I want my kids to experience too. My aunts and uncles will be displaced from their homes.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. Unfortunately the preferred alternative, 4A, would displace 17 residential structures. When required, the project proponents would provide compensation to property owners for losses due to implementation of the alternative.
3267	1	Real alternatives to the tunnels exist, but have not been given serious study. A project this large demands more transparent and complete discussion	The BDCP/ California WaterFix EIR/EIS evaluates 18 action alternatives. The action alternatives were selected through a rigorous three-step screening process and documented in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives- Conservation Measure 1, of the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS. The lead agencies believe that the EIR/EIS meets CEQA and NEPA requirements to evaluate a range of alternatives. For more information regarding alternatives to the proposed project please see Master Response 4.
3268	1	I have lived in Isleton my whole life. The farmers need the water here. We have resorts. If the tunnels come then so will the salt water and that will be the end for us and our farmers.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Deliveries to in-Delta senior water rights users are the same under the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and all action alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS in accordance with existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. Considerations of changes to agricultural water users due to implementation of the action alternatives (not climate change, sea level rise, or projected population growth that would have occurred with or without the proposed project) are discussed in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources. Changes in Delta water quality that could affect agricultural water users are discussed in Chapter 8, Water Quality, including changes in bromide, chloride, and electrical conductivity. Potential changes in recreation resources are presented in Chapter 15, Recreation. The proposed project is not projected to result in a substantial decrease or increase in Delta surface water levels; and therefore, would not result in changes to recreational resources that are dependent upon surface water elevations.
3269	1	The "Water Fix" will destroy the Delta and its' farming, fish migrations, recreation, and the economic engine that supports our region. You are asking to destroy our region so greedy corporate interests can profit. Governor, you are speaking out of both sides of your mouth when you hold yourself up as champion of the environment.	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 comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3270	1	I love the Delta. The lack of water flow to the San Francisco bay and the ocean will	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		have a tremendous impact on the ecosystem. No tunnels! None!	<p>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>
3271	1	I believe this is the wrong approach to solving California's water problems. It will have a huge negative impact on Northern California. Please stop this insane water grab from big money Southern California interests like Stuart Resnick and his cronies. Let's work together to find a better solution that works for everyone.	<p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).</p>
3272	1	The Delta waters are our life's blood out here. The tunnels will destroy the delicate ecosystem.	<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>
3273	1	The BDCP tunnels would be costly and have disastrous effects on our Delta estuary. How much money is enough for mega growers in the southern Central Valley who are the only [ones] who will profit from these tunnels?	<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.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			proposed project. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.
3274	1	Northern California needs our water: for farmers, and fish, for making sure seawater doesn't encroach into the Delta. For making sure our aquifers don't collapse. For the salmon, and trout, for the redwoods and the last stand of old growth timber in California. If Southern California needs water, I suggest desalination and greywater reclamation. There are many things they can do, without robbing us more than they already do. Northern California is more important than a legacy project for Jerry Brown to slap his name on.	<p>The Proposed Project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the Proposed Project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e., 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Chapter 5 Water Supply of the Final EIR/EIS. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p> <p>The proposed project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies needed to meet California's overall water management needs. It is not a substitute for increased commitments to other water supply solutions, including recycling, desalination, water conservation and storage. Please refer to Master Response 37 (Storage) and 7 (Desalination) for additional information on why these are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>The project was initiated by former Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, who was twice elected by a majority of California voters. The process has continued under the administration of his successor, Edmund G. Brown, Jr. Hence, the project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please refer to Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives and 44 on the proposed project's effects on Northern California.</p>
3275	1	I love the Delta, and it needs to stay the way it is for the farmer, the fish, the people, the birds and all the wildlife. The tunnels are a very bad idea	<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>
3276	1	I want to save what we have...I want to save the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3277	1	I do not want any tunnels built to divert water.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environment impacts in the EIR/S were raised.
3278	1	The tunnels will ruin the ecosystem of the Delta	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			operational flexibility.
3279	1	Fish and Delta farms, not oranges in the desert.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3280	1	I love the Sacramento River Delta. I know many of the family farmers in this area. I see how this plan will devastate the Delta. I am also from Southern California and visit family there often and must pass through hundreds of miles of irrigated fields and groves which grow in arid land artificially made fertile with chemicals and imported water. I also see that most places in Southern California continue to use water waste fully by overwatering yards, spraying down hardscapes and allowing water to rush down the gutters. It is unfair and downright criminal to make us the taxpayers finance a water system which will destroy our ecosystem, ruin local family farms and provide cheap water to large wasteful factory farms.	<p>As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. 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, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management). These actions are being considered to meet future water demands for planned municipal uses consistent with water demand projections in the recent Urban Water Management Plans submitted to DWR which include approaches to meet the 20 percent per capita urban water use by 2020.</p>
3281	1	I believe in the preservation of the Delta and the farming communities that have been here for decades, contributing greatly to the Bay-Delta culture and lifestyle. As well, we do not want our Northern California water utilized for big agri-business south of us and for the purposes of dangerous natural gas extraction activities. Words cannot express how disappointed I am in Governor Brown.	The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry.
3282	1	This is just madness. A stupid idea that will hurt many for future generations.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3283	1	I oppose the continued decimation of the local environment. The amount of saltwater intrusion is beyond acceptable. This impacts our local Delta farmers, small towns, and local industries.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS.
3284	1	Our family has grown up fishing and boating on the Delta. We do not want to see this beautiful area and wildlife destroyed.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3285	1	Grave concern. This cannot happen.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3286	1	This will be an ecological disaster for Northern California and the Delta, not [Governor] Brown's fat cat farmers in Central and Southern California.	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.
3287	1	A tunnel is a narrow minded, regressive and environmentally destructive non-solution to an issue that looms over the State for the rest of its existence. Removing water from a point which already deals with less than optimum flows during drought years	The project objectives and purpose and need of this project do not address changing the Delta levee systems to allow for changes in the location of the Sacramento River. 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		is not a solution.	the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor any change in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high.
3288	1	The project is an inappropriate waste of water, money, time and harms what should be nurtured and purportedly aids what does not deserve at their expense.	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.
3288	2	It is a boondoggle to nowhere. Governor Brown tried this in a previous administration. Please stop it cold. It has no merit and many minuses.	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.
3289	1	We live on the Delta and they need to leave the environment there the way it is without further damage.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3290	1	I moved from Tahoe to the Delta in 1998. I live on Sherman Island. I know the outcome. Figure something else out. "We have only one life, don't blow it".	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3291	1	Tunnels will destroy our Delta and farming!	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.
3292	1	This is my hometown and where I grew up. Lots of family and friends that will be affected by this project. Figure out another plan with all the smarts you all have and money. There has got to be another way. And pray for rain because if you do [the project], it may [have] been done for nothing without [any] water. Figure it out.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3293	1	I am adamantly opposed to the Delta Tunnels. What I would do to the area would be devastating, not to mention how it would interfere with the annual migration of several species of birds. Leave the Delta alone. Find another means to repair the current water flows to the farmers and Southern California.	The lead agencies disagree with the commenter's characterization of the impacts and direct the commenter to Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS, which addresses project effects on migrating birds. Chapter 12 describes the impacts to natural communities and wildlife species, both negative and positive, and discusses measures that would be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts and to compensate for significant impacts.
3294	1	The overpriced, under-publicized project will sink more political careers than Los Angeles developers we hope.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3295	1	I have family that live in the Delta and it would be devastating to see all of my childhood memories be gone!	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.
3296	1	We need sustainable water solutions. Not another continuation of 19th century ideas. It is past time to upgrade our water policies and infrastructure to be more in tune with the needs of ecosystems and the realities of the water cycle. This is particularly important in the era of climate change.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.</p> <p>Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).</p>
3297	1	[Expletive deleted] your tunnels. The project will take too much time and require too many resources to actually accomplish. If I remember correctly, the current plan is to create and trench two twin 17-foot diameter pipes for over 600 miles down California from the Sacramento River to Los Angeles, requiring somewhere in the \$30 billion range to do so. Residents of the Delta are basically paying money to give away our resources while harming our environment for both ourselves and the wildlife. Where will this water go? Straight into the overpopulated city in the middle of the [expletive deleted] desert. And Jerry Brown calls this the "California Water Fix"?	DWR acknowledges your opposition to the project. Please refer to the RDEIR/SDEIS Proposed Action for the correct description of the proposed project. The tunnels would be 40 feet in diameter (not 17) but only run for approximately 30 miles (not 600) from the proposed north Delta diversion to the existing pumps in the south Delta. The project would cost approximately \$15 billion to build (not \$30 billion). There would be additional costs for mitigation of approximately \$800 million. The water would be used by the State and Federal water projects that supply drinking water for 25% of Californians, and for agricultural production throughout northern, central, and southern California.
3298	1	The tunnels will finish the destruction of the Delta that was started by the two canals!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3299	1	This would probably put my kayak rental business in the red.	Waterways would remain navigable in the vicinity of all project construction. Implementation of mitigation measures and environmental commitments related to noise, visual effects, transportation, agriculture, and recreation, would reduce adverse effects (see Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs). Because construction of water conveyance facilities would result in an increase in construction-related employment and labor income, this would be considered a beneficial effect. However, these activities would also be anticipated to result in an adverse effect. Changes in recreational expenditures could also affect regional employment and income, but these have not been quantified. The total change in employment and income is not, in itself, considered an environmental impact. Significant environmental impacts within the meaning of CEQA would only result if the changes in regional economics cause reasonably foreseeable physical impacts.
3300	1	The tunnels will destroy the Delta as we know it.	Please refer to Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place).
3301	1	The Delta is my home.	Please refer to Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place).

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3302	1	This will ruin how we live.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3303	1	I want the beautiful Delta to be left alone to support the wildlife and wilderness that is so vitally important to that ecosystem. We as people need to stop destroying the natural environments that surround us. Haven't we learned yet that wilderness areas are critical to the health and wellness of our planet?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3304	1	The Delta tunnels are a bad idea. I live on Bethel Island and I will see the impact it will have on our ecosystems. Please do not mess with our natural habitat.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3305	1	I am opposed to [putting] in two tunnels to divert more of our Northern California water to Southern California. Also, to use eminent domain on as many as 300 farms in order to accomplish this project. No farms equals no food. News flash- food doesn't magically appear in the grocery store. It has to come from somewhere, unless we are planning on importing all of our food, which will only make prices go up. Plus, consider the long-term environmental effect on the Delta. Governor Brown doesn't care as long as he gets his bullet train and his tunnels.	The BDCP/California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry.
3306	1	Stop the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3307	1	Our preservation of the Delta, its' communities, agriculture, wildlife and ecosystem are important to me and the generations beyond. The Delta is important to us, please don't take what is ours!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3308	1	The tunnels are a bad idea that do not help the people of California!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3309	1	This will be an environmental disaster! And an economic one for the Central Valley. Big money pushing around an already hard hit area.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), and Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).
3310	1	I oppose the tunnels for environmental, fiscal, and economic reasons. I also am opposed to eliminating the many small family farms who will lose their farmland via eminent domain.	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.
3311	1	I oppose the tunnels. Leave the Delta alone.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3312	1	The Delta is the Life of our valley! I have seen so many areas drying up! This is a drought, not a competition for money or power! Where water flowed is now mud puddles! Down in Southern California they have a desalination factory. Use it! What can't Brown and the rest of the money- hungry thugs understand? The Delta is not the same, we are in a drought! We will be left dry. All fisheries and wildlife will be	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for more information on the purpose and need for the project, Master Response 4 regarding project alternatives, Master Response 6 regarding demand

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		depleted. Thank you	management, and Master Response 7 regarding desalination.
3313	1	The current plan focuses too much on diverting water, and too little on the health of the habitat.	The approach for California WaterFix (Alternative 4A) is to meet the requirements of Section 7 of the ESA to avoid jeopardizing the continued existence of listed species and avoid adverse effects on critical habitat. Operation of the north delta diversions is intended to maintain and improve Delta ecosystem health under certain circumstances by implementing diversion and other operational criteria. Restoration actions under this alternative are focused on reducing the construction and operational effects of the water conveyance facilities. The State is also implementing the California EcoRestore program, a related but separate program, to further improve the Delta ecosystem. EcoRestore would restore up to 30,000 acres of habitat in the Delta.
3314	1	Our farmers - the agricultural capital of the world - need this water! Hollywood doesn't!	State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 4 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via proposed conveyance facilities.
3315	1	As an outdoorsman, conservationist and resident of the Bay Area of Northern California, I oppose the short sighted and irresponsible plan for the Delta tunnels. The Sacramento Delta is one of Americas' biggest deltas. It is a habitat for many fish, birds, waterfowl, plants and other wildlife. Funneling more water out of it will destroy its salinity and other abilities to be balanced and sustaining. Instead of our water going to Southern California, maybe the governor needs to focus more on desalinization plants for water. They are expensive, but big picture, will pay for themselves in the long run.	<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 regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.</p> <p>Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).</p>
3316	1	It should be a crime to destroy the habitat that supports so many different species. The Delta is a sacred place that my children and I enjoy being a part of. And I will support any movement to protect our precious California Delta #notunnels	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.
3317	1	The damage the tunnels will do will devastate our beautiful water habitat forever.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			operational flexibility.
3318	1	This is the most detrimental option to supply Southern California with water, environmentally and financially. You could build a number of de-salination plants for the same cost or capture existing water runoff in underground cisterns.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
3319	1	Not only is it a waste of tax dollars, it would devastate our Delta and surrounding areas.	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 5.
3320	1	Tunnels would ruin the entire Delta area.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3321	1	[I care about] the environmental damage this project would do to the San Francisco Bay.	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.
3322	1	The tunnels will destroy California!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3323	1	<p>The tunnels are a mistake, both financially and environmentally. Protecting the Delta will have its rewards for all of us, not just Delta farmers, although they deserve all the protection they can get. The fact that we are in a drought is no reason to ignore all of the environmental sanctions in place to protect endangered species. We need to find permanent solutions to our existence in an arid West, solutions that benefit farmers, salmon fishermen, and wildlife, not just South of Delta agribusiness (translation, water contractors) who are the [ones] complaining about “losing” some of their millions in annual profits.</p> <p>I have read the long Delta Tunnels Alternatives Plan, and do not see one mention of the environmentally sound plans proposed by scientists who are experts in their field. I know about all the money that has been wasted so far, and say Enough Already.</p>	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for more information on the purpose and need for the project, Master Response 4 regarding alternatives to the preferred project, and Master Response 5 regarding cost and funding of the preferred project.
3324	1	This is not a solution to a “fix”. What needs to be fixed is getting our government to stop making matters worse. Sorry I voted for you this time around, Jerry.	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.
3325	1	I am against the tunnels taking Northern California's water. Please preserve our beautiful Delta, full of wildlife, birds, fish, long-time farms and so much history. Southern California needs to build reservoirs and figure out where to obtain their own water. Do not plant or build in places where there is no water.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for more information on the purpose and need for the project, Master Response 37 regarding storage, and Master Response 35 regarding Southern California Water Supply.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3326	1	The tunnel is insane.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3327	1	Leave our waterways alone.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3328	1	I fish the Delta, and the tunnels will turn the Delta into salt just like this year with not a lot of fresh water flowing in.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
3329	1	I oppose the crazy tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3330	1	This is a terrible plan. Costly and destructive.	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.
3331	1	We give enough water to Southern California.	The proposed project aims to allow the federal and state water projects to deliver more reliable water supplies, in a way less harmful to fish. The plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Please refer to Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).
3332	1	The imbalance of natural resources for California's agriculture and wildlife--both flora and fauna--must not be terminally imperiled as a short-term solution to over-population of the Bay Area. Options within the State's financial reach are being implemented elsewhere in the State. In permanently drought stricken areas such as Australia, cost-effective options are employed daily, ones that have not even been brought to the table in Sacramento. The tunnels may once have seemed a viable option. Now they are worse than wrong-headed. Let's put the Alaska pipeline to logical application and drain some of the melting glaciers to our reservoirs and ground table.	Shipping water from Alaska is beyond the scope of the California WaterFix or the BDCP. 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. 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.
3333	1	Stop the water grab!	The proposed project aims to allow the federal and state water projects to deliver more reliable water supplies, in a way less harmful to fish. The plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Please also refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports/Area of Origin/Water Rights)
3334	1	Water is the life giver. It belongs to no one, yet should be available to all as needed. It should never be in the total realm of special interests such as tunnels which take but give nothing back: no tunnels!	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 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.</p>
3335	1	I think that this project would damage the San Francisco Bay estuary.	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.
3336	1	Fish need water, too.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3337	1	I do not want the Delta destroyed, or our farmers to lose their family owned farms. Fresh, clean water supports 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>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 regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Potential effects on the aquatic and terrestrial biological resources in the Delta are described in Chapters 11 and 12, respectively. Considerations of changes to agricultural water users due to implementation of the action alternatives (not climate change, sea level rise, or projected population growth that would have occurred with or without the proposed project) are discussed in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources. Changes in Delta water quality that could affect agricultural water users are discussed in Chapter 8, Water Quality, including changes in bromide, chloride, and electrical conductivity. Potential changes in recreation resources are presented in Chapter 15, Recreation. The proposed project is not projected to result in a substantial decrease or increase in Delta surface water levels; and therefore, would not result in changes to recreational resources that are dependent upon surface water elevations.</p>
3338	1	The tunnels are a very bad idea. We need more desalinization, improved existing storage, and more reclamation of grey water. The tunnels do nothing but satisfy a few, and hurt the Delta ecosystem. Please stop the Tunnels!	<p>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 EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>For more information regarding demand management and purpose and need please see Master Response 6 and 3, respectively.</p>
3339	1	I do not believe the tunnels are an effective way to help California's water situation. I believe the tunnels would have horrible environmental impacts as well. Step out of the box and find a real solution!	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			operational flexibility. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3340	1	The Delta is a unique place for boating and fishing. There is no way to assure that the tunnels will not adversely affect it. It makes sense that less water in the Delta will be very bad for it.	Operations of Alternative 4 and the new preferred alternative, 4A, are not expected to result in a substantial decrease or increase in Delta surface water levels. Please refer to Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Modeling Results, EIR/EIS, for more information. Please also refer to Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need.
3341	1	I have lived in and appreciated the San Joaquin Valley all my life. Our valley feeds so many in various ways and needs to remain vital to all of us.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3342	1	Tunnels are the worst possible solution to the water problem.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. 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. For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.</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>
3343	1	I oppose the Delta tunnels! I want to save and restore the Delta! I want to protect the wildlife! I want to save the Delta Farms!	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3344	1	Our resources are for all the people, not nuts in the desert or for political gain.	The proposed project aims to allow the federal and state water projects to deliver more reliable water supplies, in a way less harmful to fish. The plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years.
3345	1	<p>I enjoy the natural beauty of the Delta. It is naturally sustainable farming and Eco-system. Almonds in the desert on dry land is not.</p> <p>Paramount took a gamble buying land that could go dry in a drought. Well, guess what Mr. Resnick, wait for water like the rest of us.</p>	Since the late 1800s, the Bay-Delta ecosystem has been substantially altered. Changes in key environmental attributes of the Bay-Delta have contributed to the current degraded state of the ecosystem and appear to be proximate causes of declines in desired fishes and increases in non-native species. California Waterfix is not intended to address all the factors that have contributed to the Delta's decline and briefly summarizes a few but not all of those factors. Many factors that have contributed to the decline of the Delta's ecosystem including the conversion of tidal marsh and floodplains to farmland, construction of levees and altering of tide flows, in-Delta and upstream water diversions, contaminant discharges, ammonia and nutrient discharges and changes to the food web, increases in water temperatures, and introduction of non-native

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			and invasive species. The Delta will remain in a highly altered state for the foreseeable future and the project is not intended to address all the past harms or restore the Delta to a pre-altered state.
3345	2	Jerry Brown, please stop selling California's resources to high bidders.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3346	1	I'm signing because I love our Delta and want it preserved, and I don't want billions spent on destroying our precious estuary!	Since the late 1800s, the Bay-Delta ecosystem has been substantially altered. Changes in key environmental attributes of the Bay-Delta have contributed to the current degraded state of the ecosystem and appear to be proximate causes of declines in desired fishes and increases in non-native species. California Waterfix is not intended to address all the factors that have contributed to the Delta's decline and briefly summarizes a few but not all of those factors. Many factors that have contributed to the decline of the Delta's ecosystem including the conversion of tidal marsh and floodplains to farmland, construction of levees and altering of tide flows, in-Delta and upstream water diversions, contaminant discharges, ammonia and nutrient discharges and changes to the food web, increases in water temperatures, and introduction of non-native and invasive species. The Delta will remain in a highly altered state for the foreseeable future and the project is not intended to address all the past harms or restore the Delta to a pre-altered state.
3347	1	I'm signing because this is one of the most environmentally ignorant plans the uneducated governor has supported. For them to think this was a smart and viable option shows their corruption and/or intelligence.	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.
3348	1	I strongly oppose building the tunnels to southern California. I want to restore the Delta, preserve our fishing, continue farming in our area, and quit spending taxes on things that don't help my area.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3349	1	I'm signing this because the tunnels will be the death of the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3350	1	I'm signing because the tunnels will be devastating to the ecology and economy of the San Francisco Bay-Delta region. Many wildlife migrations depend upon a healthy Delta. The tunnels will undermine multi-generational, sustainable Delta farming to support high water intensity agriculture on unsustainable land. The people have voted this down before. Why do we need to keep fighting these insane tunnel projects?	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3351	1	I am signing because I see a day possible when we grow food sustainably, without chemicals to pollute the water, and with respect to the water that is available. I believe that when we live in harmony with the Earth and restore the Delta, abundant natural resources will replenish and revitalize the local economy along the waterways and the cities they connect. Win win!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3352	1	Gov. Brown must hate Northern California. Every water issue is marked to destroy our water resources.	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.
3352	2	Get some of Southern California's money and build water refinement plants that suck	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		the water from the ocean.	
3352	3	Are waterfront homes more important? Guess we know what that answer is. I was against the canal and I am against the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3353	1	I am signing as the state should spend the money on creating new water, like new reservoirs or desalination plants.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
3354	1	Our way of life cannot be sustained with salt water. How are we supposed to grow crops with salt water? How do we export crops that we cannot grow?	Please refer to Master Response 14 (Water Quality).
3355	1	Due to recent drought years, California needs to look into building many more reservoirs in various locations, not transport water from one area to another.	<p>While water storage is a critically important tool for managing California's water resources, it is not a topic that must be addressed in the EIR/EIS for the proposed project. This is because the proposed project does not, and need 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 purposes of CEQA and NEPA, just as future storage projects would be. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, of the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the development of alternatives. Please see Master Response 6 for information on Demand Management.</p>
3356	1	This is so wrong. We chose to live here in Rio Vista to be close to the Delta. I raised my boys here. I worked hard and bought a home here. I drive 1 hour to Oakland every day...and love coming home to my Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3357	1	You only have one chance to save the SF Bay Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
3358	1	Moving water will not solve the problem. I don't want to pay for this.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environment impacts in the EIR/S were raised.
3359	1	It will ruin the Delta. It will cost 30 -50 billion and for some reason they dropped the promised environmental remediation of the Delta.	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. Although Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A include only those habitat restoration measures needed to provide mitigation for specific regulatory compliance purposes, habitat restoration is still recognized as a critical component of the state's long-term plans for the Delta. Such larger endeavors, however, will likely be implemented over time under actions separate and apart from these alternatives. The primary parallel habitat restoration program is called California EcoRestore (EcoRestore), which will be overseen by the California Resources Agency and implemented under the California Water Action Plan. Under EcoRestore, the state will pursue restoration of more than 30,000 acres of fish and wildlife habitat by 2020. These habitat restoration actions will be implemented faster and more reliably by separating them from the water conveyance facility implementation. Refer to Master Response 5.
3360	1	I want the water to stay and keep the Delta healthy. And the California agriculture down south shouldn't be there. We should not subsidize it while we have a drought, or ever.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. Senior water rights holders are not affected by implementation of action alternatives. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation would be able to pump from the proposed north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
3361	1	<p>I'm signing the petition because water is our most precious resource and southern California needs to figure out how to make their water stretch. They are like greedy stepchildren that just keep grabbing for the goods without making adjustments in their behavior!</p> <p>Who is going to replace our water when we need it? Come up with some alternatives here, like more water storage for example!</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>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>
3362	1	Northern California needs that water for people, farming, fish and wildlife.	As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.
3363	1	Big business at the expense of small business is bad business!	Please see Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need.
3365	1	Tunnels are a very bad idea for Northern California.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3365	1	This project would be devastating to the local economy and environment.	
3366	1	I oppose the tunnels. There are other options to resolve the water issues in Southern California. Desalination plants and growth restrictions in the natural desert areas are two such examples.	<p>The proposed project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies needed to meet California's overall water management needs. It is not a substitute for increased commitments to other water supply solutions, including recycling, desalination, water conservation and storage.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please refer to Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives and Master Response 7 for information on desalination and why it was not included as a project alternative.</p>
3367	1	We need to protect the Delta and restore it for the benefit of migrating birds, fish and nearby farmers.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3368	1	I have been living on the Delta for 46 years (all my life). I fish and use the Delta for recreational use all the time but mainly fish it. The schools and the roads here in California need more attention; they are horrible. I am tired of sending Southern California our water so they can water their lawns. They can spend this money on our schools and roads not Central California.	Please see Master Response 35 for information on water supply in Southern California. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3369	1	This is a destructive plan.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3370	1	The damage the tunnels will do to the Delta!	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.
3371	1	You are trying to deplete the largest estuary in the western United States. Listen to the people. We do not want the tunnels. The whole ecosystem will be ruined.	<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>
3372	1	We told Governor Moonbeam no to his Peripheral Canal 1.0 plan back in the 80s. This is just his sneaky way to get around those voters. He will not give up, trying to ship our Northern water to Southern California where they just waste, waste, waste and I say no, no, no!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3373	1	Do not ruin the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3374	1	I am disgusted with your lack of reasoning for this plan. It simply does not work to take water out of its natural environment. Stop piping our water away! Stop fracking for that matter! Millions of gallons of water wasted on fracking and you think piping it will help anyone?	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
3375	1	I am a 7th generation involved in Delta agriculture. Delta agriculture was here before Jerry Brown and his father as well as Stewart Resnik's, Diane Feinstein/Dick Blum's and Nancy and Paul Pelosi's investments. The greed they impose is more than unethical and immoral. May their heirs reap their immortality.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3376	1	I have a boat in the Delta and I fish a lot there. The tunnels would destroy fishing forever.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.
3377	1	[I care about] the negative chain effect [the WaterFix] will have on our environment and economy. Why would we destroy farms which have been proven naturally productive, some for over a 100 years to attempt to farm in a desert? This will make the ground water salty (nearly to Sacramento). Imagine all of the agriculture this will kill off. In turn thousands of jobs will be lost and revenue gone and over 300 productive farms put out of business including vineyards, blueberries, peaches, pears, asparagus and tomatoes just to name a few.	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.
3378	1	Destroying farmland and disrupting nesting for waterfowl and fish is not the solution.	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.
3379	1	These tunnels will harm the Delta and a whole regions' way of life. Build desalination plants in Southern California.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
3380	1	I oppose the tunnels. I grew up in the area and am a wildlife biologist and ecologist by degree. This is an important area of ecology for the entire state and any changes made would destroy it beyond repair.	<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>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3381	1	[I signed the petition] because I fish and play in the Delta. Build desalination tanks not bullet trains.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
3382	1	The Delta is a wonderful estuary that many people and animals enjoy. The tunnel will destroy it. Southern California needs to find another source of water; taking ours is not the answer.	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.
3383	1	I want to help save the Delta and all that thrives in it and keep it for my kids to enjoy one day the way that I have.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3384	1	The tunnels will do irreparable harm to the Delta.	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.
3385	1	I'm signing because the Delta is a crucial part of my life. As someone who has grown up on the Delta, it pains me to think that I may not be able to share this gem with future generations. Passing on our family traditions of boating, fishing, and hunting are crucial. Our environment here is unique and beautiful, and deserves to be protected. Let's remember that this drought happens once every twenty years, but this Delta is part of our lives environmentally and economically every single day. I am definitely opposed to these 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. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).
3386	1	I am concerned about the environmental impact. We don't need any more construction in Southern 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. The plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Although the project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable. Please also refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports/Area of Origin/Water Rights) and 35 (MWD Water Supply).
3387	1	I'm signing this because I don't believe all of the water in the Delta should be piped south at the cost of the state's largest estuary. This is an environmental disaster waiting to happen. Please scrap this project.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal and State regulating agencies, ESA compliance, and project design. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods to improve ecosystem conditions in the Delta. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.
3388	1	For our future.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3389	1	Please stop the tunnel project. The Delta and fisheries are already being crushed by pumping too much water out of the estuary. Restore California's commitment to the environment and halt this project!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
3390	1	I think this is a very bad idea - could destroy our state's most valuable source of water. Spend the money on more storage.	Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.
3391	1	I am an environmental scientist, I see the tunnels as a political issue not something that will help with water storage. There are better ways to handle the water situation than jacking up the Delta.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3392	1	I oppose the tunnels and the water grab that will degrade the Delta ecosystems and drive extinctions.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
3393	1	California needs more water storage instead of this plan.	Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.
3394	1	These tunnels will devastate our states major fisheries.	The commenter does not offer any evidence on how the project would result in significant fisheries impacts related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3395	1	I grew up in the Delta. I am saddened and deeply concerned about the negative environmental impact that these will have on the Delta region.	Please refer to Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place).

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3396	1	These tunnels will destroy the Delta Rivers and streams, kill the Delta smelt, kill Salmon breeding grounds and protected fish. [These will] change our livelihood in the Delta forever. Shame on you Governor Brown. You will ruin our lives in Northern California.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3397	1	I'm signing this petition because this is not good for the river, the Delta, California, or the environment. This is clearly a land and water grab. This is only good for huge corporations. Say no to this bad plan!	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3398	1	I live in the Delta area and presently enjoy the water quality and farm land. We will lose all of this if the tunnels are constructed.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3399	1	The new EIR/EIS has not adequately addressed my concerns. That is why I oppose the Delta Tunnels/California Water Fix (Alternative 4A).	The comment does not raise any specific environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3399	2	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.	Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 8 evaluated in the EIR/EIS decrease monthly 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 winter months when the river flows are high. A summary of the impacts of these alternatives as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative are presented in the Executive Summary of the EIR/EIS and each resource-specific chapter of the EIR/EIS. Overall, the average annual Delta exports are less in Alternatives 2, 4 (H2, H3, H4), and 5 through 9 than under Existing Conditions, as shown in Figure 5-17 of Chapter 5, Water Supply, of the EIR/EIS.
3400	1	I am signing this petition because I am very concerned about our waters health and how it effects the health of all living things around it.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
3401	1	The needs of the Delta and Delta residents, as well as water users in Northern California and the Bay Area, have been minimized or disregarded.	The commenter does not offer any evidence on how the analysis related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS has disregarded or minimized the Delta ecosystem, Delta residents, or water users in Northern California or the Bay Area For more information regarding preserving the Delta as a Place please see Master Response 24.
3401	2	The tunnel plan fails to address how the tunnel projects will mitigate salinity, toxic run off and contaminant disturbance during construction and after. It defers to an unknown time estuary restoration. This is bad engineering. Please stop pursuing it.	Water quality impacts during construction of the project alternatives are addressed in Chapter 8, Water Quality, in Impact WQ-31. The remainder of the comment is on the merits of the project and does not raise issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3402	1	I love the Delta (I am an avid sportsman) and have watched it being destroyed for years by the pumps already installed. These [tunnels] will kill the Delta for sure and prove a death sentence for our fisheries. It should be criminal to pass this tunnel project!!	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. With mitigation incorporated, the proposed project would not result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing or operating the proposed water conveyance facilities. For more information, please see Impacts REC-4 and 5 in Chapter 15, Recreation.
3403	1	I have boated in the Bay and the Delta for 35 years and I do not want the tunnels! Save our Bay and Delta Waters!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3404	1	Tunnels at the time of Pat Brown's governorship or even Jerry Brown's first governorship might have looked like a good idea, but with so much new information it's time for our governor to stand up like the intelligent man he is to say, "I've made a mistake. There are too many dangers that would result from the tunnels. I'm withdrawing my plan."	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3405	1	I'm signing the petition because I care about our wildlife!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3406	1	I don't want the Delta destroyed! This [tunnel project] will be a catastrophe to the Northern California region that depends so much on the Delta and local farmers!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation).
3407	1	I am worried about the future of the Bay and Delta. I am worried for my children and grandchildren.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3408	1	I know the consequences of what these tunnels will do. Please think of the environment instead of money when making the decision.	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.
3409	1	Water needs to stay in Northern California.	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 regulating agencies, State Water Board, ESA compliance, and project design. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.
3410	1	The tunnels project doubles down on a failed policy of taking water from the North and sending it to the wealthy agribusiness barons in the South! It will not create any additional water and will ultimately cause the destruction of the fisheries, the Delta farmers and the overall water quality of the Bay Delta estuary!	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Deliveries to in-Delta senior water rights users are the same under the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and all action alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS in accordance with existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. Considerations of adverse impacts to agricultural water users due to implementation of the action

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>alternatives (not climate change, sea level rise, or projected population growth that would have occurred with or without the proposed project) are discussed in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources. Changes in Delta water quality that could affect agricultural water users are discussed in Chapter 8, Water Quality, including changes in bromide, chloride, and electrical conductivity.</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>
3411	1	I abhor the thought of repercussions resulting from this major loss of water to our fisheries and the damage it will also do to our Delta in all respects including flora and fauna.	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 comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3412	1	These tunnels are disasters: financially, ecologically and in the survival of the Delta.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. 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.
3413	1	The twin tunnel project is dumb, making as much sense as the "high speed choo choo". Inadequate water supply in Northern California and [Governor Brown] wants to send it south.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3414	1	It is not fair for the people down in Southern California to take our water and destroy our ecosystem.	As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.
3415	1	The tunnels are insane.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3416	1	We must save our wetlands!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3417	1	The health of the Delta and the Bay depend on the regular flows of fresh water from the Sacramento River. Diverting it away from its historic flows will irreparably impact the health and well being of the ecosystem there.	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.
3418	1	If they build the tunnels they would be ruining the most important Delta west of the Mississippi!	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			operational flexibility.
3419	1	These tunnels would divert needed water from the Delta estuary that is needed to protect and keep the Delta healthy for farming, fishing and wildlife and it would only go to Southern California Big Ag corporate farming operations who have pumped their own groundwater supplies so empty that they need to steal water from other who need it more extremely than they do. These Southern Agricultural corporations were always aware they were trying to grow crops on poor soil without a quarantined water source. They knew the risks but ignored them. Now they are playing dumb in an attempt to steal water from the Delta area that has always needed its own water desperately to control salinity intrusion and to keep the Delta agricultural community and fishing and wildlife healthy, too. You cannot steal from one and give to another if the one you steal from suffers dire consequences which would occur from this huge amount of water that Southern California agricultural corporations want to divert. The Delta is the David to their Goliath. Please help us!	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). The proposed project would not increase the amount of water to which SWP and CVP hold water rights for use allowed under their contracts and permits and approvals for refuge water supplies or other environmental purposes.</p>
3420	1	This harebrained scheme will cause irreparable harm to San Francisco Bay and Delta habitat.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3421	1	This is the worst idea that will not give California more water and will severely damage the Delta and the environment!	<p>The Proposed Project is intended to provide a more reliable water supply, with diversions that are more protective for fish, in accordance with the Delta Reform Act co-equal goals of improving water supply reliability and Delta ecosystem health. (Master Response 31 [Delta Reform Act]).</p> <p>It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
3422	1	The Delta functions for many uses -- to provide water and food for humans and other species. Don't ruin it.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3423	1	Taking homes and farming away from so many people is unacceptable. Leaving	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		farmers with only saltwater will destroy so many people and fish.	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 14 regarding salinity.
3424	1	I don't want you to destroy our Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3425	1	It won't work. Simple. A waste of billions of dollars and threatens ecosystem, wildlife, farming that provides food nationwide; will cause more salinity problems as well as provide many cities with drinking water. We have vehemently objected to this project since 1982.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Responses: 3 (Purpose and Need), 14 (Salinity), 5 (Cost), 36 (Peripheral Canal).
3426	1	Nature takes care of us so we need to take care of it, or lose it.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3427	1	I care about the environment and our local Delta farmers over the greed of mega-agribusiness.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water) and Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation).
3428	1	Stop destroying a sacred, beautiful, and natural estuary just to politically satisfy closed-door deals that you probably made to get the top seat in California. Put conscience over politics.	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.
3429	1	Northern California's water is not there to be pillaged.	It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented California WaterFix project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Please see Master Response 26 for additional information on effects on northern California.
3430	1	Plain and simple, it won't work! Too many vital things will be destroyed, forever, in the building process. Completely a bad idea for California and its Delta. Critical thinking leads to the conclusion it's wrong and a very bad idea.	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.
3431	1	Maybe you should put all this money towards desalination in the south instead of stealing water from the natural environment it is supposed to be in.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
3432	1	I oppose the tunnels because I believe it will have a negative impact on the Delta. Farms that have been in families for years will be taken by eminent domain. These	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		families will be impacted financially.	<p>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>For more information regarding impacts to agriculture please see Chapter 14 of the FEIR/EIS. For more information regarding economic compensation please see Master Response 46.</p>
3433	1	We cannot destroy this amazing ecosystem more than we already have.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3434	1	The tunnels will kill wildlife.	<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>
3435	1	It's not right to make half the state pay because of Westlands. It is all about big business and money. Governor Brown, you should be ashamed.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3436	1	I have lived on the Delta my entire life. This is my home and sanctuary and needs to be protected. This is a limited resource and is not the solution to provide water to farms created in the desert!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3437	1	I live near the Delta, and tunnels are not the solution we need for our water crisis.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3438	1	Please don't change what Mother Nature created.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3439	1	The tunnels will destroy the Delta as we know it. The wildlife and fishery will never be the same. Water vital to the farms and those living in Northern California being shipped south is just not right.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3440	1	I am a fisherman and believe in conservation of our waterways and the wildlife within them. The tunnels will do nothing but make things worse, not better for anybody or anything.	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.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3441	1	The Delta area is my home. The Delta area is my family's work area; without it we are left with no source of income, no home, and nowhere to go. California's economy will suffer without the San Joaquin Delta economy.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. As described in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, under Alternative 4, Impact ECON-1, construction employment is estimated to peak at 2,427 FTE jobs in year 3. Total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) would peak in year 12, at 8,673 FTE jobs. Direct agricultural employment would be reduced by an estimated 16 FTE jobs, while total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) associated with agricultural employment would fall by 57 FTE jobs. The proposed project would not take away the Delta. Because construction of water conveyance facilities would result in an increase in construction-related employment and labor income, this would be considered a beneficial effect. For more information regarding socioeconomic impacts and its associated mitigation measures please see Chapter 16 of the FEIR/EIS. For more information regarding Delta as a Place please see Master Response 24.
3442	1	I'm trying to keep the world healthy. Bring on the sustainability.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
3443	1	I have been enjoying the Delta since I was 10, and I don't want it turned into a barren salt marsh. No good can come from these tunnels except to line the pockets of the water sellers.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 14 for information on salinity.
3444	1	The Delta shouldn't be destroyed so that people in Los Angeles can keep watering their lawns.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3445	1	I don't want to see a fragile ecosystem destroyed!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
3446	1	I love the Delta. There is already a saltwater intrusion issue without the tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
3447	1	It's just the same as taking water out of your toilet tank while there is something in the bowl. It won't flush.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3448	1	I want to protect the San Joaquin-Sacramento River Delta and the wildlife that depends on it.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3449	1	I care for the Delta [and] the fishing environment. These tunnels that you are trying to build will destroy all farms, animal habitats and fisheries that I love. You money-hungry politicians don't care what Mother Nature created [and] you building these tunnels for Southern California [because] they so-called need water is all BS. Please don't build these tunnels [because] your money politicians need to fill your pockets [and] destroy what we love here in the Delta for money.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3450	1	Our Delta is a freshwater haven for many species, especially the human species. Taking Delta water will cause its death, due to saltwater invasion from the Bay.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
3451	1	I don't want Northern California water to be sent south.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environment impacts in the EIR/S were raised.
3452	1	I want the Delta to stay how it is. With farmers and wildlife that will be destroyed if the tunnel is built.	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.
3453	1	Water is precious to Northern California for wildlife, the Delta, and agriculture.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3454	1	This is a power grab by Governor Brown to negate the will of the people, and to appease his progressive liberal base. The people have spoken in 1982. That said, Governor Brown must take this to the people for a vote.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3455	1	I don't want the Delta ruined.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3456	1	The destruction of the environmental is no longer excusable by ignorance. These tunnels are not an environmental, economic or practical solution to the Delta Bay's water woes.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3457	1	I live in Stockton, am an avid boater and am afraid the tunnels will further degrade the ecology of the Delta, and my ability to use this wonderful resource for my own recreation, and with Stockton's new potable water source from the Delta, I am afraid of degradation of that.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need for the project and Chapter 15 of the Final EIR/EIS for information on impacts to and mitigation for recreation.
3458	1	They are creating a bigger problem. Stop the tunnels!	The documentation generated by this proposed project has undergone extensive public and scientific input, discussion, and transparency, including the posting of administrative draft chapters online and providing many more opportunities for public participation than is normally required by the CEQA/NEPA processes (see Master Response 41 [Transparency]).
3459	1	The tunnels are bad for the people of California.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3460	1	I want to save the purity of the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3461	1	I love the Delta! We have five boats and enjoy every bit of the wildlife the Delta has to offer. The tunnels will destroy a beautiful piece of California forever.	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.
3462	1	I love the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta waterways. Our rich agricultural lands require good water to grow the food that feeds all of us. Southern California is wasteful of our Northern California's precious resource, water.	State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 4 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via proposed conveyance facilities.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3463	1	Los Angeles needs to store its own snowpack and runoff. Build more watershed [storage] down south. Bypass all the political BS and start building dams now!	For information regarding why water storage was not included in the proposed project, refer to Master Response 37 (Water Storage) and Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management.
3464	1	We would rather pay higher prices for food and keep the water flowing where it would naturally would.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3465	1	Because it is what's right! We should not allow Brown or any other politician to deepen their pockets any further with greed and destroy the beautiful Delta.	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.
3466	1	I've been boating on the Delta for 40 years. Removing fresh water where the rivers deliver it to the Delta will be catastrophic. That will forever alter the ecosystem and the billions who count on it. Don't [expletive] up here. Tunnels are the beginning of the end for many. Desalination, you guys. Get it together.	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. For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
3467	1	Conservation, not water theft! Don't destroy the Delta!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.
3468	1	California has done a spectacularly bad job of managing water, selling obscene amounts to wasteful industries and even to Nestle who bottles it and sells it back to us, surely laughing hysterically about the profit made at our expense. Our aquifers are turning salty, collapsing and polluting with fracking waste. Not one more project should be undertaken by this administration or with any influence from industry, including mega-agriculture. Stop everything. First, tell all industries that their access to water will hinge on eliminating wastefulness and waste. Fracking must be banned in California for a list of reasons too long for this space. And Southern California should realize that it is meant to be dry most of the year. If they want water, conserve and recycle rather than sucking Northern California dry. No tunnels from where the water is from and where it is appreciated to the land of swimming pools and golf courses to keep their lifestyle up while wrecking ours. All efforts and funding should go into conserving and cleaning water! Tunnels are a ridiculous non-solution to our water problems.	Regarding water use, the proposed project does not make determinations regarding how water delivered through the proposed project conveyance or other water conveyance facility will be put to a beneficial use. The State Water Resources Control Board is charged with the comprehensive planning and allocation of water resources in California. One of the State Water Resources Control Board's charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. Please refer to Master Response 34 for additional details on beneficial use. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 35 regarding Southern California's water supply.
3469	1	It will cause environmental harm.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3470	1	This project, in every sense, on every level, is a reckless and organized criminal endeavor. The state of California and Jerry Brown look to steal from us again, holding all living creatures hostage, for profit. They seek profit, caring nothing for process, honesty or environmental concerns. It's wrong and it's a psychopathic plan that needs to be halted.	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.
3471	1	Because the Delta is home to farms growing food, many kinds of plants and animals, and stores the carbon, cutting down on global warming.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3472	1	The Delta is the lifeline for Northern California agriculture. It has its own ecosystem. Very bad consequences will come if that water is removed, death will come to this natural water source area.	State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 4 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via proposed conveyance facilities.
3473	1	These farmers in the desert can live with the water that they have already. There has been too much destruction.	State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via proposed conveyance facilities.
3474	1	I boat and fish in the Delta, Leave water for the fish! Majority do not want tunnels, Governor Brown.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Operations of the new preferred alternative, 4A, are not expected to result in a substantial decrease or increase in Delta surface water levels. Please refer to Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Modeling Results, EIR/EIS, for more information. Therefore, surface water levels would remain close to existing for fishing and recreation.
3475	1	This is not a viable solution to the water crisis. We voted down the peripheral canal years ago and Governor Brown is trying to sell this again as tunnels this time. It is not what needs to be done.	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.
3476	1	The Delta is truly one of California's most beautiful areas. I do not want to see it ruined.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3477	1	The tunnels are a terrible idea. They will cause irreparable harm to the environment.	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.
3478	1	The tunnel project is a poorly designed project that simply amounts to a water theft by Westside opportunists and Southern California developers, taking water from those with legitimate prior rights to the water. The cost estimate is hugely underestimated and the project does nothing to enhance the State's water supply, nor does it enhance any needed environmental restoration. It will create more salt water intrusion into an already fragile and damaged Delta.	Several issues raised by the commenter address the merits of the project and do not raise any specific issues related to the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Please see Master Response 5 regarding costs and Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need of the project.
3479	1	Major changes in either water or land always turn out to a result in major changes in the environment. The approval needs to be slowly, deliberately and wisely considered. This is not happening thus my disapproval.	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.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
3480	1	This idea is a ridiculous and insane. Money and water will both be wasted on implementation and California cannot afford any more loss of either.	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. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.
3481	1	Do not kill our beautiful Delta, stop this madness. I feel for farmers, but they only generate about 3% of California's economy. Water is scarce and I am not into taking water from the Delta and family farmers along the Delta. Only to give it to million dollar corporate agribusiness.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water) and Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation).
3481	2	Governor Brown, I consider you a sellout, and a traitor to the people of California.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3482	1	We need the Delta and the biodiversity it provides.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
3483	1	We need our water for people to drink, before unsustainable food crops.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation. The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). The proposed project would not increase the amount of water to which SWP and CVP hold water rights for use allowed under their contracts and permits and approvals for refuge water supplies or other environmental purposes.
3484	1	I am signing because I grew up fishing the Delta and I do not want to see it destroyed by pointless tunnels.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.
3485	1	I am signing this because I use those waterways year round for fishing and enjoying the water. It is my duty to protect what is my best interests. The Delta is a precious resource to many fish protected by the state (salmon, sturgeon (green and white), steelhead) and many other species of fish and birds. The farmers already get a regulated amount for farming, I do not see why we need to give anymore. They have got around fine with their already regulated share of Delta water. Especially in a 4 year drought.	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 comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3485	2	Water is a precious resource I do not see why we would be pumping more water in a drought. It does not seem logical. I feel there are better options like desalination plants.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
3486	1	This idea will ruin the Delta. Find another source	Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. Please also refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives Development and Tunnel Option).
3487	1	Retain the delicate balance of Northern California ecosystems.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3488	1	The tunnels are not needed and destroy precious land. Please stop with this foolish move!!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3489	1	I feel Southern California residents need to show a greater concern for the fragility of our water ecosystem. The deplorable conservation efforts of many Southern Californian cities during this drought prove they do not respect the fragile water system we have in California. Before the state is allowed to build twin tunnels to rob from the Delta, more storage areas should be built to hold surplus water during the rainy years.	For information regarding why water storage was not included in the proposed project, refer to Master Response 37 (Water Storage) and Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS. 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, Master Response 35 regarding Southern California's water supply and Master Response 34 for additional details on the determination of beneficial use.
3490	1	This is so wrong! More and more of the same old boondoggle.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3491	1	I grew up on the delta and know how this will affect the land, the people there, and	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		affect the food source for many people.	
3492	1	Logic tells me that this wi!! be a financial and environmental disaster.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3493	1	Our Delta is important to the ecosystem of the entire coast, the farmers who live and work there and the health of our economy. Current water policies are destroying it and endangering California.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3494	1	I'm tired of rehashing this issue for 20 years!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3495	1	It's a reckless idea that I believe will destroy the ecosystem in the Delta.	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.
3496	1	We have bigger problems that should be dealt with ... This drought being one! A tunnel is stupid!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
3497	1	I'm signing this because I don't want our Delta ruined!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3498	1	The Delta is my playground and I refuse for it to be destroyed. Building tunnels will create havoc for home owners in Discovery Bay and could damage the environment and ecosystems.	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. For more information regarding impacts to socioeconomics please see Chapter 16 of the FEIR/EIS.
3499	1	The delta is a beautiful place, it needs to remain as it is for the animals and plants which require it to live. It's a place for humans to relax with a nice Sunday drive, a place to teach children about nature. Please don't take our Delta from us!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3500	1	I support the conservation of the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3501	1	There are other, less costly, less harmful, solutions. The Delta has a special ecosystem (that is nutrient dense and full of life) unique to the west coast of the Americas, we	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		must do what we can to let it thrive. Stop the tunnels, save the delta!	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 on the purpose and need for the project and Master Response 4 regarding project alternatives.
3502	1	I have grown up on the Delta swimming, boating, and fishing. I am now raising my granddaughter in and around the Delta waterways. Construction of the Tunnel would effect water quality and species. Please don't ruin our waterways.	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).
3503	1	The water in the Delta should not be used in mass quantities to irrigate almond and pistachio trees that are planted on unsustainable grounds for export.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). The proposed project would not increase the amount of water to which SWP and CVP hold water rights for use allowed under their contracts and permits and approvals for refuge water supplies or other environmental purposes.</p>
3504	1	This is wrong on so very many levels, it will cost hundreds of millions of dollars and could break a billion when simply restoring our waterways and researching shrooms costs mere 10's of millions of that and because there is absolutely no reason for them other than a way for Mr. Brown to spend precious tax dollars.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3505	1	I oppose the building of the tunnels due to the ecological and environmental impact it will have on the Delta, as well as the destruction of prime farmland.	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 Final EIR/EIS Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, Impact AG-1 and Impact AG-2 and their mitigation to mediate important farmland in the Delta. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3506	1	I oppose the Delta Tunnels. The Delta is necessary and precious to those depending on it; farmlands, recreation, wildlife, communities -- water sustainability, etc. It has been clearly opposed by residents and ratepayers, yet politicians continue to find a way to steal it despite the fact there will be devastating environmental, public health	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		and economic consequences.	operational flexibility. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3507	1	I am signing because we should not be destroying Northern California.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3508	1	I grew up on the Delta. I am a farmer's daughter. These tunnels would destroy my family's land and history. Tunnels are not the answer to any question.	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.
3509	1	Governor Brown is killing my quality of life by allowing salt water to intrude into my ground water.	<p>Salinity in the Delta is a function of the amount and timing of freshwater input from the major tributaries, tidal action from San Francisco Bay, and exports from the Delta. During the late winter and spring months of seasonally elevated flows, and in wet years, seawater intrusion is limited and the Delta has mostly low salinity. During low-flow summer and fall months, and during dry years, lower freshwater flows result in greater amounts of seawater intrusion. Staff from DWR and USBR constantly monitor Delta water quality conditions and adjust operations of the SWP and CVP in real time as necessary to meet water quality objectives set by the State Water Resource Control Board protection of agricultural water supply, municipal and industrial drinking water supply, and fish and wildlife beneficial uses. See section 4.3.4 for a discussion on the proposed projects effects on water quality, salinity and electrical conductivity.</p> <p>Effects of the alternatives on salinity levels are described in Chapter 8, Water Quality, and Appendix 8H, Electrical Conductivity, EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Modeling results indicate that the implementation of the water conveyance facilities may positively or adversely affect in-Delta water quality, depending on a number of factors including location, time of year, and hydrologic conditions. See tables in Appendices 8E through 8N for specific results related to various water quality constituents (including bromide and chloride).</p> <p>In addition to potential effects associated with the project and alternatives, modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the proposed project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.</p>
3510	1	I am signing because my friend's farm, which has been in her family for three generations, would be destroyed by this, without any monetary compensation. This is theft. It is immoral.	The BDCP/California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. Although both the construction of new physical facilities in the Delta and the restoration of habitat will lead to the conversion of some amounts of agricultural land in the Delta, effects of the proposed project will be subject to aggressive mitigation efforts. Land that is not directly affected by construction or habitat restoration should remain productive. Please see Master Response 18 for more information regarding agricultural impact mitigation. As described in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, where required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses associated with implementation of the proposed project.
3511	1	It will not work and it will destroy the Delta ecosystem. You cannot irrigate with salt water.	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 14 regarding salinity. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			in the EIR/S.
3512	1	The Delta needs to be saved. Enough is enough.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3513	1	There are other solutions that would leave less of a footprint and do less damage.	Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. Please also refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives Development and Tunnel Option).
3514	1	This is a waste of money and displacing the farmers that feed us.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3515	1	I refuse to let Brown disrupt an ecosystem to turn Northern California into a desert while giving even more water (aqueduct) to Southern California, an actual natural desert. It's just plain idiocracy! no tunnel!	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.
3516	1	The tunnels will finish off the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3517	1	Not only should we sent our water to the desert for crops of almonds that are mainly being sent to Asia, building tunnels are extremely costly and much of the "precious" water will be lost in evaporation! Is not our country in debt enough? And wasting water is stupid!	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 regarding the purpose and need for this project and Master Response 6 regarding demand management. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3518	1	Because our valley farmers need to have access to water and not be rationed to the point that they can't plant their fields. California feeds the nation!	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.
3519	1	To preserve the estuary, bay and protect wildlife and the unique and longstanding Delta economy and ecosystem. We wholeheartedly reject this plan which, last we heard, has no financial gain for California and only serves to support agriculture in a blighted area for a few mega farmers in middle California at the expense of a mature agricultural area full of families and local businesses.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water) and Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation).
3520	1	It will lead to the destruction of our family farm.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. In its efforts to achieve the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration, the California WaterFix seeks to protect dozens of species of fish and wildlife in the Delta while also securing reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California. Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed California WaterFix.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3521	1	We need to continue the conservation efforts already set out instead of just relocating water in a time of drought from an already over used source.	<p>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.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. 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>
3522	1	There is a big ocean off the coast they could use instead of spending the money to take the water our area needs.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
3523	1	The Delta needs to remain intact as it is for the fish and wildlife that depend on it!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3524	1	I oppose this environmental nightmare.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3525	1	I am signing because my family has owned and farmed this very same land that is being threatened for over 100 years. Support your local farmers and generations of families that would be affected by this government bullying.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. In its efforts to achieve the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration, the California WaterFix seeks to protect dozens of species of fish and wildlife in the Delta while also securing reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California. Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed California WaterFix.
3526	1	It's wrong to take more water from the California Delta. You can count on more droughts, and many wasteful people taking advantage of the tunnels. We live next to one of the largest bodies of water anywhere on earth, yet we cannot siphon from there because is too expensive. But it's ok to spend two million dollars to rename a mountain. Should be against the law to spend any tax payers funds without a vote!	As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. 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. Please refer to Master Response 5.
3527	1	I grew up on the Delta my whole life. It's truly a part of me. I know several farming families who count on the Delta for watering their crops. They need to find another way.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3528	1	My family has been farming on the Delta for over 150 years. We have just started raising our 7 generation on the ranch. How dare you take our heritage and way of life away to support farming in a desert or having swimming pools and lush golf courses	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		in the vast waste of space that is Southern California.	
3529	1	How will we ever recharge Northern California aquifers if we ship all that water south?	As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The proposed project would not include conveyance of groundwater and would not result in reductions in SWP and CVP water deliveries under the proposed project as compared to the No Action Alternative; and therefore, would not affect groundwater elevations north of the Delta.
3530	1	This is a huge risk to the economy, public health and the environment of the San Francisco Bay Delta region.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3531	1	I oppose the tunnel construction and the destruction of the delta!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3532	1	Do not want the Delta destroyed.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3533	1	I am an outdoorsman I fish and hunt and I believe these Delta tunnels will threaten our fishing and hunting. I want my children enjoy the outdoors as much as I did growing up. Some of my family and friends are farmers seeing how their water has been cut and then looking at all the irrigation used in the south I feel we to the north need the water more.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Operations of the new preferred alternative, 4A, are not expected to result in a substantial decrease or increase in Delta surface water levels. Please refer to Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Modeling Results, EIR/EIS, for more information. Therefore, surface water levels would remain close to existing for fishing, agriculture, and recreation. The proposed project would have less than significant impacts on upland recreational activities (Impact REC-11). Please also refer to Master Response 26 regarding changes in Delta exports.
3534	1	This doesn't solve California's water issues, it adds infrastructure to support a long term bad model that continues to feed the state's issues with ag after and doesn't help anyone long term.	For a discussion of purpose and need of the California WaterFix, please refer to Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need.
3535	1	This project has been a joke from the beginning. Nothing more than a political watergrab for the rich south valley water cartels. The biological opinions alone(there have been several) tell it all.This project will doom the Bay, the Delta, Delta farmers, the fish, and potentially water supplies of the Bay Area. Non the tunnels once and for all!	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.
3536	1	I want to protect the environment for future generations.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3537	1	The delta is too precious a resource to spoil in a misguided attempt to "fix" nature.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3538	1	I'm against the tunnels or any other plan that will change the current Delta waterway.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3539	1	I'm 3rd generation Bay Area born and raised, my family still lives on the Delta. This plan is destruction on so many levels I can't believe any sane person who wasn't	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		motivated entirely by self interest could support it.	designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
3540	1	Taking fresh water from the northern portion of the Delta will result in increased salt water intrusion into the Delta to satisfy the thirst of Westlands and Metro Water Districts at the expense of the five Delta Counties.	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.
3541	1	Keep the Delta intact!	Since the late 1800s, the Bay-Delta ecosystem has been substantially altered. Changes in key environmental attributes of the Bay-Delta have contributed to the current degraded state of the ecosystem and appear to be proximate causes of declines in desired fishes and increases in non-native species. California Waterfix is not intended to address all the factors that have contributed to the Delta's decline and briefly summarizes a few but not all of those factors. Many factors that have contributed to the decline of the Delta's ecosystem including the conversion of tidal marsh and floodplains to farmland, construction of levees and altering of tide flows, in-Delta and upstream water diversions, contaminant discharges, ammonia and nutrient discharges and changes to the food web, increases in water temperatures, and introduction of non-native and invasive species. The Delta will remain in a highly altered state for the foreseeable future and the project is not intended to address all the past harms or restore the Delta to a pre-altered state
3542	1	The tunnels are destructive to the Delta and taxpayer money.	The commenter does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS.
3543	1	My ancestors founded the town of Walnut Grove, CA- in the heart of the Delta. My great grandfather was a river boat captain from the Delta to San Francisco. I grew up there... It is my home, my roots. It should not be destroyed by these tunnels. They are not the solution!	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
3544	1	We do not need these, we need more storage.	Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.
3545	1	The Delta needs the Sacramento River water.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.
3546	1	I'm sick and tired of Northern California stealing all our water. We have brown lawns and take 5 minute showers but Southern California is too cool for that. Let them start living off what they get and not reward them.	Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply). No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS documentation were raised by the commenter.
3547	1	I'm signing this petition because I'm from California and I think this would destroy the Delta for wildlife and for Californians.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
3548	1	Once we make changes like this proposed change to nature there is no undoing it - and we need nature intact in the long run. Let's be guided by long term thinking guide that is in harmony with the ecosystems that ultimately sustain us.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
3549	1	Oppose the destruction of the Sacramento Delta with these tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3550	1	This will negatively impact the Delta and is a huge waste of money.	Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding). 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.
3551	1	Because Los Angeles is a desert and it should stay that way.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
3552	1	We have lived on the Delta for 32 years, with the river out our back door. The environmental impact these ridiculous tunnels will have on our beautiful Delta are beyond comprehension. Please leave our Delta alone.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3553	1	I live in the Delta and have all my life. It does not require much thought to realize over the years that the Delta will never recover without fresh water flowing through the lower basin. If the tunnels are completed our way of life will be diminished and our natural resource will decline. Please find water another way for the Los Angeles region.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
3554	1	Bad for farmers, bad for the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3555	1	Environmental concerns and loss on our own community's behalf.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3556	1	Save the Delta. There are other ways to get water than destroy my natural habitat.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			operational flexibility.
3557	1	We don't need more Northern California water going south. Money should be spent on better projects like desalination plants.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
3558	1	I am signing because this sort of huge engineering project will not solve the water problem. Water cannot be made with money; money can only work to help preserve existing supply. The underlying problem is one of conservation.	<p>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.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. 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>
3559	1	I want to protect the environment, not destroy it for financial gain. I'm a logical person who lives in reality, there just isn't enough water, conservation, preservation, not devastation!	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 Responses 5 (Cost and Funding).
3560	1	We need to preserve the fresh water into the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3561	1	I grew up in the Delta. Would hate to see this beautiful area be destroyed by these 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. 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).
3562	1	Do not lose pear ranches and people homes.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3563	1	I am a conservationist, fisherman, hunter, outdoorsmen. I care deeply for the Delta and what it means to our environment and economy.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3564	1	The tunnels will not solve the problem of water supply reliability since they will not be able to be operated in a drought. They will only be an enormous cost to the State and will ruin the Delta ecosystem and community.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Deliveries to in-Delta senior water rights users are the same under the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and all action alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS in accordance with existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>The total amount of water exported by month in each water year type for each action alternative is presented in Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Model Results, of the EIR/EIS. As shown in Appendix 5A, Section C, the north Delta intake tunnels would not be fully utilized except for a few months in wet years. However, it is important to have the maximum capacity in the intakes and tunnels during those periods of time to convey water during extremely wet periods to areas south of the Delta for storage and use during drier times. The north Delta intakes would have minimal flows that would be required for maintenance of the pumps during critical dry years.</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>
3565	1	I have a place on the Delta butting up against the Clifton Fore-bay. We have reviewed the proposal and feel that the tunnels would destroy the Delta as we know it. We are against the tunnel project.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3566	1	This does nothing to capture and contain more water. This is about sending more water south. I am against it!	<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,</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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).
3567	1	I want the Delta to remain a haven for people and animals. Not a barren wasteland. The repercussions of these tunnels are beyond horrifying.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3568	1	Southern California needs to support its own water needs by investing in reservoirs and other technologies, not be stealing it from the northern part of the state. Stop letting the water that comes down in the south run off into the ocean!	<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>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 Master Response 37 (Storage) for additional information.</p>
3569	1	This project will kill the Delta and the peoples way of life also farmers cannot grow with salt 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. 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 14 (Salinity).
3570	1	This is wrong what our Governor Brown is doing help save our delta before it is too late! The tunnels plan would be devastating to the ecology and economy of the Bay-Delta region. Fresh, clean, water supports 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	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3571	1	The governor's plan does not solve any issues of water storage, address the environmental impact or have the people of California's best interest in mind. This is	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		nothing more than a legacy issue and a pissing contest because the crybaby governor didn't get his canals in the '70s so now he comes back with a vengeance, bypassing voters like a 5 year old trying to get the last word. This state has had 40+ years since the last drought to address water storage and delivery and it has, like everything else it does, failed the people by doing nothing. This is not a viable solution.	Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 36 (Peripheral Canal), and Master Response 37 (Water Storage).
3572	1	Northern California is reducing water consumption pumping our water to Southern California is a bad idea destroying the Delta that would destroy its needed existence!	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.
3573	1	As a founding member of the Golden Gate Salmon Association, I am concerned that the tunnels will be the end of the chinook salmon fishery in California.	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.
3574	1	Protect our fisheries; stop the water grab by big agriculture. Our Delta is the West Coast's largest estuary supporting thousands of jobs.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3575	1	I lived in Clarksburg for 20 years and fully appreciate the fertile farmland and what it produces. To infringe on this prime farmland and rob its farming families and the rest of us of what it produces is so wrong and can never be replaced. Please consider people before politics.	The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. In its efforts to achieve the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration, the California WaterFix seeks to protect dozens of species of fish and wildlife in the Delta while also securing reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California. Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed California WaterFix.
3576	1	We cannot lose more water to a desert in southern California. We already have saltwater in the Antioch area of the Delta. The Delta will continue to die to support a desert that should be dry and barren like it was before the U.S. entered California.	Refer to Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply) and Master Response 14 (Salinity). The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3577	1	I am signing because I strongly believe the tunnels plan would be devastating to the ecology and economy of the Delta region.	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.
3578	1	Enough with water leaving Northern California. Fish need water and farmers up here too.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3579	1	We must all make a concerted effort to protect all of our wetlands. Nursery's like those of the Delta watershed are not luxuries, they are must haves.	Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS presents and discusses impacts on wetlands. Mitigation Measure BIO-176: Compensatory Mitigation for Fill of Waters of the U.S. provides mitigation to compensate for those impacts.
3580	1	The Delta is much too valuable. People's livelihood depends on it. There has to be another solution.	Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives Development and Tunnel Option), and 24 (Delta as a Place). Socioeconomic effects of the alternatives are assessed in Chapter 16 of the Final EIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3581	1	The tunnels will destroy the Delta and California, not solving the problem but making it worse.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3582	1	I agree and support agriculture and farmers first.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. In its efforts to achieve the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration, the California WaterFix seeks to protect dozens of species of fish and wildlife in the Delta while also securing reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California. Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed California WaterFix.
3583	1	I want Jerry Brown to shut his mouth. The Delta tunnels will destroy the Delta and it's wrong. He needs to remember his job is for the people and our tax dollars pay his salary.	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.
3584	1	Diverting water from the California Delta to feed the interests of deep pocket agricultural businesses will kill the estuary and undoubtedly harm the San Francisco Bay itself. It only takes common sense to know this project is a bad idea.	<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>The range of alternatives in the EIR/EIS includes alternatives which result in reductions in SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta as compared to the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative and Alternatives 4H1, 4H2, 4H3, 4H4; 5; 6A, 6B, 6C; 7; 8; and 9 would result in less SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta than under Existing Conditions (shown in Tables 5-5 and 5-8). Similarly, Alternatives 6A, 6B, 6C; 7; 8; and 9 would result in less SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta than under the No Action Alternative (shown in Tables 5-6 and 5-9). However, SWP and CVP water deliveries would continue under all alternatives.</p> <p>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>
3585	1	The Delta has been my home for over 30 years. My family has grown multiple crops in the area. If this project goes through we will lose one of the most irreplaceable	The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		resources this area has. Our water supply is what makes the Delta such a unique and lustrous area.	people, communities, agriculture, and industry. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via California WaterFix proposed conveyance facilities and Master Response 26 for additional discussion regarding exports and water rights.
3586	1	I love our Delta, and this will destroy it.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3587	1	Because this entire process is a fraud it is an illegal land and water grab. There are other proven ways to mitigate water exports that simply do not 100% destroy one area to 100% benefit another area hundreds of miles south.	<p>A hallmark of the public trust doctrine is that projects must have a connection to water-related activities that provide benefits to the public statewide; not sacrifice public benefit for private or purely local advantage. After balancing the benefits of the proposed project against the potential harms that the proposed project is designed to address, the public trust doctrine supports adoption of the proposed project as it offers significant environmental benefits.</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.</p> <p>Since 2006, the BDCP/California WaterFix has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. All of the documents, studies, administrative drafts, and meeting materials—more than 3,000 documents—have been posted online since 2010 in an unprecedented commitment to public access and government transparency.</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.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 13 for detailed information about public trust and Master Response 41 for more information about public involvement.</p>
3588	1	I'm signing to save the wildlife and Delta community's I grew up in!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
3589	1	Brown's tunnels are the wrong choice for the state of California, and the state of our wellbeing.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3590	1	I make a living on the California Delta. It is a beautiful estuary that is set to be ruined by Governor Brown by a non-reversible fatal blow if the tunnels are approved!	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.</p>
3591	1	I am signing because I love the Delta as a place. I do not want to see it sacrificed. The California Water Fix will cost billions of dollars and its benefits accrue only Central Valley and Southern California water users not the Delta.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place), and Master Response 5.
3592	1	I do not want the tunnels to destroy the Delta that I live with!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3593	1	I strongly oppose the Delta tunnels. I want experts, not special interests (money) to be at the table.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3594	1	I love our Delta. I do not want anyone to screw up nature & drill tunnels for God's sake. Leave it alone! Our farmers & native fish cannot survive with tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3595	1	I believe [WaterFix] will ruin the integrity of our Delta salmon/sturgeon/splittail/etc.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3596	1	I'm signing because I've been lucky enough to experience the beauty of the Delta firsthand and I cannot allow anyone to destroy an important landscape.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3597	1	I love the Delta and never want to see it be drastically changed.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3598	1	I think it should be stopped before it goes any farther.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3599	1	We barely have enough water now, those tunnels will take people's property and ruin the Delta.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Deliveries to

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			in-Delta senior water rights users are the same under the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and all action alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS in accordance with existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.
3600	1	This wrong. You can't take farms and ranches away from families who have been there for more than one hundred years that feed the country. It is bad enough that properties were taken for the "High Speed Rail" which does the same as Amtrak.	The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. In its efforts to achieve the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration, the California WaterFix seeks to protect dozens of species of fish and wildlife in the Delta while also securing reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California. Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed California WaterFix.
3601	1	We have to stop the tunnels. They will destroy the Delta!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3602	1	The tunnels will destroy the Delta. Take the water on the west side past Rio Vista. Keep the flow north east to west.	<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. Deliveries to in-Delta senior water rights users are the same under the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and all action alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS in accordance with existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4. 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 by the Lead Agencies are discussed in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 3A explains why various proposals were not analyzed in the EIR/EIS, including concepts that include diversion facilities near Rio Vista, including a potential alternative with an intake at Sherman Island and intakes near City of Antioch. The ability to divert water in the western Delta (e.g., near Rio Vista, Antioch, Decker Island, or Sherman Island) could be limited due to the presence of delta smelt in the winter and spring months by requirements of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife. In July through November, salinity could be too high for use by the SWP and CVP facilities, especially as sea level rise progresses. Therefore, these alternatives were not evaluated in detail in the EIR/EIS.</p>
3603	1	I do not agree with the Governor when it comes to the way he has handled the states issues relating to our water. There are many conflicts of interest in the decisions that he makes. He is yet to convince me on how it is that all of us will benefit from this. Because it seems to me like the Governor is more concerned with getting water 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
		the people in the Southern part of California and he is willing to sacrifice the Delta to do so.	
3604	1	This plan will devastate the Delta and its fisheries. Farmers have gone too far with permanent crops instead of annual crops and are wiping out the water resource of the state. Southern California needs to further develop it's resource for water and reduce use from Northern California.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). The proposed project would not increase the amount of water to which SWP and CVP hold water rights for use allowed under their contracts and permits and approvals for refuge water supplies or other environmental purposes.</p>
3605	1	We rejected this in 1982.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 36 (Peripheral Canal).
3606	1	The water should stay up here.	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.
3607	1	I'm signing because I want my grandchildren to experience the fisheries that I have experienced in my lifetime.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.
3608	1	The Delta is a Northern California feature not something to be destroyed and robbed from to support an area that should never been allowed to sprawl so badly. Additionally it will kill the farming that has been here for generations!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3609	1	The tunnels would devastate the Delta, funds should be allocated for development of other alternative water sources.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 4 (Alternatives) and Master Response 6 (Demand Management).
3610	1	I love the Delta the way it is. Vote for no change.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3611	1	I'm signing because I'm a fisherman and enjoy fishing the Sacramento River.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.
3612	1	The tunnels ruin the fishing.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.
3613	1	You are further robbing from an already compromised natural resource that's sensitive ecology (and the humans who live and work within it) will suffer from as a result. We can't have a more saline estuary. Our local flora and fauna deserve the water that is naturally theirs.	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.
3614	1	The Delta is my home and the tunnels will devastate the land and hurt our farmers and businesses. Southern California needs to build some desalination plants.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
3615	1	I am an avid angler and hate to see wonderful fisheries destroyed for senseless reasons.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.
3616	1	My family has spent the last 20 years on the Delta. It is a beautiful and important part of our lives. It will be forever changed in a very damaging way.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 45 (Purpose and Need).
3617	1	You can't farm with salt water.	Effects of the alternatives on salinity levels are described in Chapter 8, Water Quality, and Appendix 8H, Electrical Conductivity, EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Modeling results indicate that the implementation of the water conveyance facilities may positively or adversely affect in-Delta water quality, depending on a number of factors including location, time of year, and hydrologic conditions. See tables in Appendices 8E through 8N for specific results related to various water quality constituents (including bromide and chloride). In addition to potential effects associated with the project and alternatives, modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the proposed project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>water further into the Delta than occurs at present.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 14, Water Quality, for more details regarding effects of the alternatives on salinity levels.</p>
3618	1	It will ruin our economy system. Southern California needs to find alternatives such as sea water desalination. These tunnels will ruin central California fish and effect our farmers which provide more food to the US and the world than any other place in our nation.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
3619	1	Taking water from the Delta will damage fish species that are native to California.	As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. 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, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.
3620	1	I'm signing because I don't want to lose my family home. It is right in the path of destruction!	When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the proposed project.
3621	1	I do not support the tunnels because we need to protect our Delta watershed. How about you big brains in the capital figure out how to catch and store water in Southern California.	<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. 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. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <p>Master Response 37 (Storage) addresses why additional water storage was eliminated from consideration in the Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS through the alternatives development and screening process (discussed in Master Response 4 [Alternatives] 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.</p>
3622	1	I'm signing because I love the Delta and do not want to see it ruined for a plan that won't work.	Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. Please also refer to

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Master Response 4 (Alternatives Development and Tunnel Option).
3623	1	It's wrong to ruin the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3624	1	I'm signing because I want the Delta to be as special a place for my son as it has been to me.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. For more information regarding Delta as a Place please see Master Response 24.
3625	1	I grew up on the Delta and raised my family on the Delta. These tunnels will destroy the ecosystem and life as we have known it forever.	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please refer to master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.</p>
3626	1	We need to do all we can to keep the Delta as pristine as possible.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3627	1	<p>I'm signing because building or making the tunnel will affect the water system. Perhaps polluting it more. Fisherman makes a living by fishing throughout the delta to bring home fish onto the table as food for their families. By building the tunnel, it'll affect the fish and having the fishes to relocate in the delta or river. As the result to that, fishermen will not be able to catch any fish to bring home.</p> <p>In the early 2015, most famous bass pros around the world or states would come by and fish in the delta during the tournament. These bass pro will have difficulties if the tunnel is built.</p> <p>There are ups and downs to the idea of building or making that tunnel. Bring more water down to the Southern California. But it will make the Northern California, or to say, Sacramento or other cities to go into a more troublesome drought. Farmers won't have water to grow crops. No fish in the meat market except fishes from the sea. Let's just say that, it's going to be a huge change if the tunnel is built. Best if there is no tunnel. After all, the Delta or Sacramento River is connected to the Bay Area.</p>	The commenter does not offer any evidence on how the project would result in significant pollution, aquatic, surface water, or socioeconomic impacts related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3628	1	I live on the Delta and do not want it disrupted, nor do I think it is smart to ship our water anywhere! Catch a clue!	<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. Deliveries to in-Delta senior water rights users are the same under the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and all action alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS in accordance with existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements.</p> <p>Considerations of changes to agricultural water users due to implementation of the action alternatives (not climate change, sea level rise, or projected population growth that would have occurred with or without the</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			proposed project) are discussed in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources. Changes in Delta water quality that could affect agricultural water users are discussed in Chapter 8, Water Quality, including changes in bromide, chloride, and electrical conductivity. Potential changes in recreation resources are presented in Chapter 15, Recreation. The proposed project is not projected to result in a substantial decrease or increase in Delta surface water levels; and therefore, would not result in changes to recreational resources that are dependent upon surface water elevations.
3629	1	The Delta is in bad enough shape as it is. The tunnel project could be the last nail in the coffin.	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.
3630	1	I make a living on the California Delta, I grew up fishing the Delta, my dad grew up fishing the Delta. Built tunnels would ruin hundreds or thousands of people lives.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
3631	1	I'm signing because it's ridiculous. I say cut off all water being taken out of the Delta already. They are killing the Delta, a vital source for many, and this will make it worse!	<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. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.</p> <p>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>
3632	1	The Delta as a fishery and boating area is one of a kind.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3633	1	I'm signing because we already defeated this monster years ago. I deplore you to stop this madness. No tunnels just like no peripheral canal years ago!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 36 (Peripheral Canal) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
3634	1	<p>These tunnels will ultimately mean the destruction of the Delta. When the Central Valley Project was originally conceived protections were put in place to protect the Delta from removing too much water from this ecosystem. Over the years lawmakers have diluted these protections for their own political purposes. There is no "extra" water to be squeezed from the Delta without additional damage from salt water intrusion occurring. Do the right thing and vote "No" on this tunnel project.</p> <p>Governor Brown's father began the systematic destruction of the Delta ecosystem and now he wants to finish it off.</p>	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3635	1	The tunnels, will affect my 5th generation family farm, we are in the middle of the path of the tunnels. We farm grapes and other crops and they cannot be irrigated with saltwater. Plus the government already owns too much land and can't take care of what they own. They are going to ruin the Delta like they have ruined everything else that was once good that they took over.	When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the proposed project. Construction of water conveyance facilities would be sequenced over approximately 10 years. Construction of individual components (e.g. intakes, tunnels) would range from one to six years. Temporary construction-related impacts include noise, visual, and transportation, among others. The construction-related impacts are disclosed in individual resource area chapters in the Draft BDCP Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS). All impacts would be minimized and mitigated to the degree feasible and are described under each alternative in the RDEIR/SDEIS individual resource chapters and in the BDCP Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, EIR/EIS. An analysis of economic impacts of the proposed project, including impacts related to agriculture, recreation, water rates, and taxes are also evaluated and described in the Bay Delta Conservation Plan Statewide Economic Impact Report (http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/Draft_BDCP_Statewide_Economic_Impact_Report_8-5-13.sflb.ashx).
3636	1	The tunnels will destroy the place I love.	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).
3637	1	The Delta supports the livelihood of many of my close friends including my fiancé. If we lose this incredible body of water thousands upon thousands of lives will be devastated not to mention the horrible effect it will have on the environment!	Operations of the new preferred alternative, 4A, are not expected to result in a substantial decrease or increase in Delta surface water levels. Please refer to Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Modeling Results, EIR/EIS, for more information. Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need and 44 regarding exports. The proposed project is intended to provide a more reliable water supply, with diversions that are more protective for fish, in accordance with the Delta Reform Act co-equal goals of improving water supply reliability and Delta ecosystem health. The proposed water conveyance facilities provide for new water supply intakes on the Sacramento River that would be operated in conjunction with the existing SWP and CVP south Delta export operations to improve conditions for Delta fish and aquatic resources and provide for a more predictable and reliable export water supply. While a petition for a change in point of diversion is being filed with the State Water Resources Control Board for use of these new intakes, no application for any new water right is being sought as a part of the proposed project.
3638	1	I'm an avid fisherman. Sport and food. There is too much science to support a complete ecological change following the outflow of water from the Delta. Please do not go through with this foolish plan.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environment impacts in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3639	1	I'm signing because I would hate to see the Delta destroyed, including wildlife and farms that have existed for generations. The Central Valley and Southern California need to learn to conserve. On a recent trip I saw water running in the gutters as people watered their huge green lawns.	As a project prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. The proposed project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies needed to meet California's overall water management needs. It is not a substitute for increased commitments to other water supply solutions, including recycling, desalination, water conservation and storage. Please refer to Master Response 6 for

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			additional details on demand management and Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives.
3640	1	Destroying our environment for a quick fix is incompetent. This is America, we should do better.	<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. In addition to the added water management flexibility created by new water diversions and operational scenarios, the project would improve habitat, increase food supplies and reduce the effects of other stressors on the Delta ecosystem.</p> <p>Although many of the proposed alternatives included meritorious water policy principles, the proposals rejected by the Lead Agencies did not qualify as appropriate alternatives for various reasons. For example, proposals were rejected because they were inconsistent with the project's objectives and purpose and need or included components that are beyond the scope of the project. The text of the Draft EIR/EIS in Chapter 3 (section 3.2) and Appendix 3A to that document thoroughly explain the process used to develop the alternatives, and explain why certain potential alternatives were considered but ultimately rejected by the Lead Agencies.</p> <p>It is important to note, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 (Demand Management) for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives), Master Response 31 (Delta Reform Act), and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
3641	1	I am signing because this is wrong. And I enjoy fishing this and bringing big events to the west coast because of it! Which brings revenue to you city!	Fishing would still be accessible throughout the Delta. Table 15-15 in Chapter 15, Recreation, lists the recreation sites that would be directly impacted by the proposed project. Please refer to Impacts REC-4, 5, and 9 regarding fishing.
3642	1	The tunnels need to be stopped. The Delta needs to be saved.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3643	1	This will ruin the home of many plants and animals.	Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect plants and animals. The chapter describes the impacts, both negative and positive, and discusses the mitigation measures and avoidance and minimization measures proposed to avoid, minimize, and compensate for any significant impacts.
3644	1	I fish and grew up on the Delta and would hate to see that go away.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3645	1	The Delta is one of the very few natural resources left in the Bay Area and it draws people all year long for recreational activities. The tunnels will ruin the natural state of this waterway and affect the latest California economy for the worse.	Recreation would still be accessible throughout the Delta. Table 15-15 in Chapter 15, Recreation, lists the recreation sites that would be directly impacted by the proposed project.
3646	1	I not only make my living on the Delta, but it runs through my backyard, as well as through the fabric of my family and who we are.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3647	1	This is a very bad idea.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3648	1	I fish these Delta waters and do not want Governor Brown to ruin this beautiful treasure.	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.
3649	1	More water for more growth is not the answer.	<p>As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management). These actions are being considered to meet future water demands for planned municipal uses consistent with water demand projections in the recent Urban Water Management Plans submitted to DWR which include approaches to meet the 20 percent reduction per capita urban water use by 2020.</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>
3650	1	I grew up in the Delta and it is an important place to maintain for future generations!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3651	1	There is no mitigation to undue the horrific damage to the Deltas watershed if this plan goes through hundreds of family farms taken by eminent domain. Species decimated. All Bad. Stop playing Creator Governor Brown.	<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>
3652	1	I'm doing my part to help save the Delta from paid-off political hacks.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
3653	1	These tunnels are a bad idea. Save our Delta, save 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.
3654	1	It's wrong to destroy our waterways and it will mess up our ecosystem.	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
3655	1	I am signing because Jerry Brown is a dumb [expletive deleted] and doesn't care about California. He is all about votes and to old to make decisions for us anymore. I like to fish in the Delta often.	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.
3656	1	Protect the Delta and the ability to use it.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3657	1	I oppose the "tunnels" and other "conveyance" systems that will take away or divert any water from the California Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3658	1	I grew up on the Delta and fished it my whole life -- my family also and now my kids, too. But the tunnels and the dams they put up already have drastically impacted the Delta low tide all of big break and surrounding area weeds and the bottom. If this continues, in less then 2 years, the Delta is gone and it breaks my heart. The tunnels are gonna turn us into a desert while everybody takes our water, destroying environments all around so when it dries they can build houses. I'm fighting this till the end. It's not a good movement -- the tunnels are a man made disaster.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 33 for more information on the purpose and need for the project.
3659	1	Building these tunnels is the wrong thing to do.	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.
3660	1	I want the preserve the wildlife and freshwater fish we have in this area. This also includes the natural landscape in the valley.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
3661	1	I truly believe the tunnels would cause more harm than good for California.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3662	1	I am signing because the tunnels will ruin the Delta habitat and lots of recreational opportunities.	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. See Master Response 3 for more

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			information on the purpose and need for the project and Chapter 15 (Recreation) of the EIR/EIS for a description of potential impacts and mitigation for these impacts on recreation.
3663	1	I am an avid fisherman and former tournament director. I am extremely interested in the health of the Delta for all species, including humans! The "Tunnels" are not a solution and will decimate the environment. Stop them now!	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.
3664	1	I am extremely concerned about the impact on the environment and ecosystem of the Delta where we work and play. In addition, I have major concerns on the negative impact these tunnels will have on the agricultural production in my community. No tunnels- we need to focus on conservation, smarter development plans and projects that will enhance our state's water sustainability for the future!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 18 (Agricultural Mitigation), and Master Response 6 (Demand Management).
3665	1	We need water condensers. Do not touch the land.	<p>Although many of the proposed alternatives included meritorious water policy principles, the proposals rejected by the Lead Agencies did not qualify as appropriate alternatives for various reasons. For example, proposals were rejected because they were inconsistent with the project's objectives and purpose and need or included components that are beyond the scope of the project. The text of the Draft EIR/EIS in Chapter 3 (section 3.2) and Appendix 3A to that document thoroughly explain the process used to develop the alternatives, and explain why certain potential alternatives were considered but ultimately rejected by the Lead Agencies.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives) for additional information.</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.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
3666	1	Southern California should not take our water and decimate our beautiful fishing estuary. This is going to affect many businesses and homeowners.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3667	1	This water belongs to the people, not the politicians! We the people have the right to decide what and where our water goes, not some floundering libtarded democrap!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3668	1	To protect the Delta salmonids and other fish species, as well as water quality and overall ecological health, by preventing these tunnels from being built.	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.
3669	1	Protect the California Delta water fishery.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3670	1	I'm tired of the [expletive deleted] and Mother Nature paying the price for our	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		stupidity - what do we do when we have completely killed her off? What then?	
3671	1	Brown is out of touch with Northern California.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3672	1	It will hurt the Delta's resident species of fish as well as the other living creatures that call it home. Stop hurting the environment and start doing it some good.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3673	1	You'll destroy the Delta by building tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3674	1	I love the Delta and destroying natural waterways is wrong and once it's done it cannot be reversed. We have a right as human beings to preserve what existed far before we did.	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.
3675	1	The tunnels are bad.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3676	1	I am a sportsman and believe that the farmers and people around the California Delta deserve this water as much as anyone else. Destroying the environment and taking water from hard working Americans is [expletive deleted].	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. Please see Master Response 3 for more information on the purpose and need for the project.
3677	1	Don't want our tunnels affecting our environment!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3678	1	Spend the money on desalination plants! We don't need more salt in our water. This won't fix the water problem. The Los Angeles area has already taken more than it should have, and they use water like it's going out of style!	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
3679	1	It will ruin the recreation atmosphere of the Delta. Salt water will take over and change the environment.	The preferred alternative, Alternative 4A, would not contain significant impacts for electrical conductivity (EC) related to objective exceedance in the Sacramento River at Emmaton, would not contain substantial degradation in the western Delta due to increased chloride concentrations, and would have less water quality effects in the western Delta related to EC and fewer exceedances of the fish and wildlife EC objective between Prisoners Point and Jersey Point. After introduction of mitigation measures, Alternative 4A, would result in less than significant impacts for EC and chloride. Please also refer to Chapter 8, Water Quality, regarding salinity or electrical conductivity impacts near Antioch, and Master Response 14 regarding salinity. Therefore, the preferred alternative, 4A, would be anticipated to result in less than significant effects on fish and water quality related to salinity, which would result in less than significant effects on fishing from a recreation perspective.
3680	1	The tunnels do nothing to create more usable and potable water for the state; it merely moves it around. The estimated \$60 billion would be better spent on reservoirs in the watersheds in Northern California, or on desalination plants. The sludge that will be removed from the river under this plan is filled with toxic chemicals and pesticides, and the plan to locate the sludge within miles of	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). 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		communities that depend on the aquifers and well water is highly problematic. It's a bad plan. Don't approve it.	resources. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed. Please see Master Responses 6 and 7 regarding desalination. The sediment removed at the intakes in the sedimentation basins would consist of the sands, silt, and gravel removed from the river. The sediment would dried at the intake sites in sediment lagoons and the dried sediment would be hauled to approved disposal sites periodically.
3681	1	I'm signing because I have to since my elected representatives are endangering my community for me, my children, and my future descendants. This is a vastly disappointing situation, the tunnels and the proposed acceptance of this danger to our health and environment.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3682	1	The tunnels are a bad idea for numerous reasons.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3683	1	I oppose the tunnels, and believe if they're built the Delta will perish.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3684	1	Tunnels will destroy the Delta ecosystem, will not address the water issues, and there are better options available to store 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. 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. Appendix 1C (Demand Management Measures) of the EIR/EIS describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply, as well as Master Response 6. Although such water demand management strategies 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.
3685	1	The idea of these tunnels is absurd in that they are willing to kill a whole estuary for more water for farmers who raise the wrong type of crops.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
3686	1	I'm signing because I don't want to see a wonderful wildlife area ruined. You can't grow crops watering with salt water. There has to be another way.	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.
3687	1	The Delta is a world class bass fishery and a marvel of nature. We need to protect this irreplaceable resource	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3688	1	I don't want to lose our water. We haven't had good rain in years, last thing we need to do if give away what water we have left.	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.
3689	1	Digging tunnels to pump water down south will destroy the Delta. The watershed is fine without a huge drought. That said, water would still be OK if the morons regulating the reservoirs did a decent job taking care of what we had	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.
3690	1	It has been there for years you would ruin a great fishery and there is no need for thi.	The commenter does not offer any evidence on how the project would result in aquatic impacts related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3691	1	I'm signing this because I believe the tunnels are unnecessary	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3692	1	I love the Delta! I do not want to see it destroyed any further by lies and special interests	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3693	1	This plan would be devastating to the ecology and economy and would not create any new 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. 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.
3694	1	I believe this is being done for political gains and has nothing to do with common sense and the realization what this will do to the environment.	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.
3695	1	I oppose sending our water to the desert!	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
3696	1	I am an avid bass fisherman and outdoors man. I would hate to see the Ddelta ruined.	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).
3697	1	I am signing this because I think this is very wrong. You are going to try and fix a problem with another problem. That is not the way. You are going to affect too many lives! I was raised on the Delta and got to enjoy all that the Delta has to offer with all the wonderful agriculture to swimming in the Delta as a child. I now live in the Southern California area with kids of my own and would love for my children to experience what the Delta has to offer. Even living in Southern California I do not think this is the right thing to do. You are going to be responsible for a lot more if you make the tunnels happen.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).
3698	1	Time to realize that there are too many people living in a desert (Southern California) and that robbing water is a Band-Aid, not a solution.	<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 proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.</p> <p>The Proposed Project 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). These actions are being considered to meet future water demands for planned municipal uses consistent with water demand projections in the recent Urban Water Management Plans submitted to DWR which include approaches to meet the 20 percent reduction per capita urban water use by 2020.</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>
3699	1	No more water for the big ag corporations.	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.
3700	1	[The tunnels] will destroy the Delta.	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
3701	1	The long term ecological health of the Delta and economic benefits derived from an unpolluted Delta are far more important than the short term profits to be had by Big Ag. It is long past time for our government to consider the well-being of the majority rather than the bottom line of the few.	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.
3702	1	I am signing because this is one of the only area where we have such a good wildlife and fishery.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3703	1	The Delta must be saved.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3704	1	I strongly oppose the building of the Delta tunnels. This will disrupt the ecosystem.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
3705	1	This will kill the Delta and a lot of its wildlife. The Delta is a big part of California and it is unfair to kill it because of a lack of planning on Southern California's part! That is just stupid.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply), and Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
3706	1	We all need to do our part to protect this incredible fishery/estuary. We will need to do our part as sportsmen. This only takes a minute.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3707	1	[I want] to save Delta bass fishing.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass.
3708	1	The proposed tunnels is a fiasco in every aspect. It will destroy the Delta not restore it.	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			operational flexibility.
3709	1	This does not fix the problems of water shortages! Look to Australia for examples of ways to live with less water!	<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>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>
3710	1	The Delta should be left alone!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3711	1	This is a huge waste of money and only serves a select few interests.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3712	1	I am opposed to disrupting the already fragile California Delta system.	<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>
3713	1	Because I want to save our Delta system.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3714	1	I care for the earth. Our ecosystems have the right to evolve and change on their own without human intervention.	<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>
3715	1	I grew up in the Bay Area and this was where I learned to fish with my dad and had my first experience with the great outdoors. Until I found Yosemite, I thought the Delta was the end of the Earth for me! Destroy this and you will be destroying one of the few great natural resources left in California! What did Mother Nature ever	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		do to you? Shame on anyone who thinks this Delta deal is anything more than another environmental tragedy!	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).
3716	1	I have grown up going boating and fishing on the Delta and I love the Delta. If you take away the water you take away people's homes and the quaint little towns will suffer.	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).
3717	1	This [expletive deleted] ain't cool! You get money but endanger our planet. This needs to stop.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3718	1	We already send two large canals to Southern California. We do not need salt water in the Delta.	<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. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.</p> <p>As described in Chapter 8, Water Quality, salinity would increase in the Delta with or without the proposed project due to climate change and sea level rise. Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods. These changes in export patterns do result in salinity increase in some portions of the Delta in some months, such as increased salinity in the central and south Delta due to reduced freshwater flows to the south Delta intakes in drier periods as compared to the No Action Alternative.</p> <p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. 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. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. 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. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.</p>
3719	1	I love fishing the Delta and want to see my future children enjoy this great body of water that we are so privileged to be able to enjoy whenever we want! Do not ruin	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		this great Delta!	
3720	1	This is an extremely ill-conceived project which is not a "water fix" and whose project managers have ignored the concerns of scientists and environmentalist citing concerns about severely detrimental impacts to the Delta ecosystem due to the tunnel project. The public did not vote for this and as a registered voter I strongly oppose the Delta Tunnels.	<p>For both environmental and economic reasons, there is an urgent need to improve and modernize the existing SWP/CVP conveyance system, which was designed and built decades ago. The ecological problems with the current system could be greatly reduced by the construction and use of new north Delta intake structures with state-of-the-art fish screens. With this future vision in mind, DWR and several state and federal water contractors, in coordination with the Bureau of Reclamation, proposed a strategy for restoring ecological functions in the Delta while improving water supply reliability in California.</p> <p>Since 2006, the BDCP/California WaterFix has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. All of the documents, studies, administrative drafts, and meeting materials—more than 3,000 documents—have been posted online since 2010 in an unprecedented commitment to public access and government transparency.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 for more information on the purpose and need for this project, and Master Response 41 for a discussion on public involvement and government transparency.</p>
3721	1	This unsustainable water grab is a folly that will cost untold billions, destroy the Delta and solve nothing. California needs to be building water storage infrastructure; something that has not happened since Jerry Brown's father was Governor before I was born.	<p>The proposed project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies needed to meet California's overall water management needs. It is not a substitute for increased commitments to other water supply solutions, including recycling, desalination, water conservation and storage.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives. Also, please see Master Response 37 for more information regarding why additional water storage alternatives were not considered in the EIR/EIS or RDEIR/SDEIS.</p> <p>Please also refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports/Area of Origin/Water Rights) and 35 (MWD Water Supply) as to how the proposed project is not a "water grab".</p>
3722	1	We need to stop this because it does not make any sense what it is going to do to benefit us. It is not! If these tunnels go through, it is going to ruin the whole ecosystem, it is going to kill all the wildlife! And we are not going to see one bit of this water. It is going to take years for this freshwater to regenerate. It seems like an easy fix but in the long run it is not worth it. It is going to ruin all the companies on the Delta and near the Delta.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years.
3723	1	I want to save the beautiful Delta and its wildlife.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3724	1	I don't want you to destroy the best drinking and fishing waterways in California.	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.
3725	1	Keep the Delta the way it is!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3726	1	As the owner of Clear Lake Bass Guide, this would take money out of my pocket!	Clear Lake lies outside of the project's plan area; the proposed project is more than 70 miles away from

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Clear Lake.</p> <p>The proposed project would not result in direct impacts to Clear Lake. Chapter 8, Water Quality, does state in Impact WQ-13 for Alternative 4A, the upstream of Delta areas in the north will benefit from the implementation of the Cache Creek, Sulfur Creek, Harley Gulch, and Clear Lake Mercury TMDLs and the American River methylmercury TMDL. These projects will target specific sources of mercury and methylation upstream of the Delta and could result in net improvement to Delta mercury loading in the future.</p> <p>Please also refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass.</p>
3727	1	The Delta is a key natural resource for the State of California. Just look at the length and expense of removing non-functional dams--this too will need to be reversed in the future as the full extent of damage from this Delta bypass becomes too obvious to ignore. Focus on the money spent on additional storage capacity or creation of freshwater from saltwater.	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. For information regarding why water storage was not included in the proposed project, refer to Master Response 37 (Water Storage) and Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS. 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, Master Response 7 for information regarding why desalination was not included in the proposed project, and Master Response 24 for details on the Delta as a place and the impacts of the proposed project on the Delta.
3728	1	This will cause a lot of problems for the future of the Delta and the amount of water they will start taking from this area.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environment impacts in the EIR/S were raised.
3729	1	Governor Brown is a moron who seems to do anything for wrong money. Do not take our farmland. How dare him to tell Californians to just shut up.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3730	1	The California aqueduct totally screwed up water quality with higher salinity and concentrated chemicals that have killed off the hunting and fishing. The tunnels will double down on the destruction of species by concentrating these chemicals parallel to Highway 4 which has chemical plants that released straight into the Sacramento River. The salinity is up to the Rio Vista bridge where we have caught skate and flounder -- salt water or bay species!	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.
3731	1	It is best for the environment and people!	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.
3732	1	I am a fishermen and would love to one day share this water way with my son and his family. Not to mention other families that depend on the water in this fragile system we all need to pull together and save our Delta.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. Fishing would still be accessible throughout the Delta during construction, although it would be restricted in the direct vicinity of construction areas. Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass, and to Impacts REC-2, 4, 5, and 9 for a discussion of impacts to fishing from the proposed project, as well as Alternative 4A in Chapter 15, Recreation, Impacts REC-3 and 7 regarding boating.
3733	1	We need better, more sustainable options for California's water needs! Be it educating people on gray water usage and even providing kits and classes, reimbursing whole neighborhoods for replacing lawns with arid gardens, use native plants and trees, and encouraging smart water collection techniques to water municipal buildings' landscape designs, we must all work together long term.	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. Rather, the scope and purpose of the proposed project is

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
3734	1	For the Governor of California, Governor Brown does not seem very interested in maintaining California's farm lands. He has shown that he is guided by the almighty dollar rather than the overall well-being of his State. Our farmland is not only important for supplying the population with food but it is also important from an economic stand point. Wake up Governor. Our farmland is important to all of us (you included) so quit trying to destroy it. Stop listening to your deep pocket lobbyist and start doing your own fact checking.	<p>More than two-thirds of the residents of the state and more than two million acres of highly productive farm land receive water exported from the Delta watershed. The proposed project aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. However, the project proponents have no authority to designate what water is used for.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 14 (Agricultural Resources) of the EIR/EIS, Impact AG-1 and Impact AG-2 and their associated mitigation measures for complete analysis of how the proposed project will effect and mediate important farmland in the Delta.</p>
3735	1	I strongly feel the water in Northern California should stay here. These tunnels would destroy a great waterway as well as put added strain on its inhabitants.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3736	1	The fishing there is some of the best in the USA! The effects will devastate this awesome body of water.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.
3737	1	Because I love this planet and [expletive] Governor Brown for even proposing such a bad idea!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3738	1	Water is for the people and should be available and free!	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. 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. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. 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. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.
3739	1	The coequal goals of both restoring the Delta and increasing infrastructure have been changed to only the latter. The money for tunnels would be better spent on modern infrastructure like urban water reuse. At the very least this project should be taken to the electorate. I am against the tunnel project.	<p>The proposed project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies needed to meet California's overall water management needs. It is not a substitute for increased commitments to other water supply solutions, including recycling, desalination, water conservation and storage.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 4 and 10 for additional details on the selection of alternatives and</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			compliance with CEQA and NEPA and the Delta Reform Act.
3740	1	Leave the Delta alone and build more reservoirs.	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
3741	1	I fish and play in the Delta and it would be absolutely devastating for millions of people if it were drained.	The Delta would not be drained under the proposed project. Operations of Alternative 4 and the new preferred alternative, 4A, are not expected to result in a substantial decrease or increase in Delta surface water levels. Please refer to Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Modeling Results, EIR/EIS, for more information.
3742	1	I am a bass angler and the Delta is my home fishing spot. It would be devastating to lose such a beautiful and valuable resource!	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass.
3743	1	I'm signing because my best grew up out there. It is her home and she doesn't want to see it destroyed.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3744	1	It's bringing in salt water where the shouldn't be. It will impact the wildlife as well as the activities people will be able to do, like being in the water.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
3745	1	I choose not to see the Delta and estuary go down the "drain". Greed and money are the governor's and wealthy farmers' of Kern County goal.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3746	1	The tunnels will turn the Delta into a brackish estuary.	<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 14 (Salinity).</p>
3747	1	We need to save our water!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3748	1	Because the tunnel will destroy the Delta fishery.	The commenter does not offer any evidence on how the project would result in aquatic impacts related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3749	1	It will ruin the water quality, fishing areas, hunting areas, and hurt agricultural areas.	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.
3750	1	We need the water in the Delta not sending it to Southern California. I fish the Delta and believe Governor Brown and his cronies are all corrupt.	As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. 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 Decisions, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods.</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>
3751	1	It's suicide for the surrounding land and ecosystem.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3752	1	California and Southern California need to reduce the dependency of Northern California water. Scratch the high speed train and focus on the true needs for California. Desalinization!	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
3753	1	Leave our farm land alone.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. In its efforts to achieve the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration, the California WaterFix seeks to protect dozens of species of fish and wildlife in the Delta while also securing reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California. Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed California WaterFix.
3754	1	Stop destroying California's natural water resources. This plan would turn the Delta into the Colorado River when it reaches the ocean (hint: it doesn't anymore). Find a more sustainable solution or the pistachio and almond farms can change their crops.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. Refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation. Please refer to Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives. Also, please see Master Response 34 for additional details on the determination of beneficial use.
3755	1	The current way of transporting water is fine, plus if tunnels are done, it would mess up the Delta.	Since the late 1800s, the Bay-Delta ecosystem has been substantially altered. Changes in key environmental attributes of the Bay-Delta have contributed to the current degraded state of the ecosystem and appear to be proximate causes of declines in desired fishes and increases in non-native species. California WaterFix is not intended to address all the factors that have contributed to the Delta's decline and briefly summarizes a few but not all of those factors. Many factors that have contributed to the decline of the Delta's ecosystem including the conversion of tidal marsh and floodplains to farmland, construction of levees and altering of tide flows, in-Delta and upstream water diversions, contaminant discharges, ammonia and nutrient

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>discharges and changes to the food web, increases in water temperatures, and introduction of non-native and invasive species. The Delta will remain in a highly altered state for the foreseeable future and the project is not intended to address all the past harms or restore the Delta to a pre-altered state.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is intended to provide a more reliable water supply, with diversions that are more protective for fish, in accordance with the Delta Reform Act co-equal goals of improving water supply reliability and Delta ecosystem health. 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.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives), Master Response 31 (Delta Reform Act), and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
3756	1	I've lived in the Delta all my life. We need to protect what's ours. Our precious resources!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3757	1	I've lived near the Delta most of my life. I care about the ecosystems that will be affected. I don't want to see them harmed.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3758	1	I'm signing because it's complete [expletive deleted]. Leave the Delta alone. Find another way.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3759	1	We need to save California from the greed down south. The growth has to stop, there is no 'new' water. What they take hurts something else.	<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. Deliveries to in-Delta senior water rights users are the same under the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and all action alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS in accordance with existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in Delta exports please see Master Response 26.</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>
3760	1	It has been the land owner's property for more than 30 years, how dare the state wants to build on land they do not own. Very wrong and unamerican.	This comment is on the merits of the project and need to acquire private land for the California WaterFix. No comments on the EIR/EIS are presented.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3761	1	Because you're going to ruin the Delta!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3762	1	I do not want to see the ecosystem of the Delta destroyed.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3763	1	It affects all aspects of one of the top fisheries in California!	The commenter does not offer any evidence on how the project would result in aquatic impacts related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3764	1	I would like to protect an ecologic and economic system that I find myself a part of daily.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3765	1	The Delta is too important and too fragile. It needs restoration, not further stress.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3766	1	The Delta needs to stay fresh water; it will turn salty without the influx of freshwater that would get pumped out. Save the fishery and thousands of related jobs around the Delta.	<p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations.</p> <p>By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria 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>Regulatory water quality objectives (or guidance values) exist for these constituents for protection of agricultural water supply, municipal and industrial drinking water supply, and fish and wildlife beneficial uses.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 14 (Salinity), Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), and Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place).</p>
3767	1	Stop moving water where it does not belong; you can not continue to engineer the state out of this drought.	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.
3768	1	You sold your water to bottlers. You allowed fracking. Your profligate use in	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		agriculture was a mistake. Your fountains and pools outrageous. Do not look to Oregon to bail you out.	
3769	1	I am signing because I have grown up with and on the Delta and I am 51years old now and I am sick and tired of seeing the Delta raped of its water. The decline of its native and nonnative fisheries from the big Agriculture corporations that have been taking far more than their share of water for way too long as is. If I was caught killing just .001% of the fish they do at their pump stations I would never see the light of day again but I guess that is how they can tell the health of the Delta by how many dead they pull out of their filters.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor any change in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal and State regulating agencies, ESA compliance, and project design. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high.
3770	1	I love the Delta, with your proposed plan you will eliminate the possibilities of me and my future family to enjoy this great American sport. All the animals that need the Delta will suffer if they do not get full effects of Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3771	1	We should engineer solutions to capture water runoff, not Delta water.	<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. 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 Master Response 37 (Storage) for additional information.</p>
3772	1	Save the Delta! Do not worry about us save the wildlife!	<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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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).
3773	1	The canals will ruin the beautiful Delta! Water grab by big Agriculture is all greed. Shameful.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria 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. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), and Master Response 26 (Change in Delta Exports).
3774	1	I do not we need to send more water south. Let Southern California and the Governor build a desalination plant. Stop screwing the north for water.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
3775	1	This project is nothing short of a boondoggle.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3776	1	Moonbeam is ruining our state and sending it down the toilet of socialism.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3777	1	I oppose the tunnels. Work on building something down south to capture water there. Leave our Delta alone!	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. For information regarding why water storage was not included in the proposed project, refer to Master Response 37 (Water Storage) and Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS. 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.
3778	1	I do not want to see the Delta destroyed. The tunnels will do nothing to fix the drought or solve the water issues that California is facing.	<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>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 intended to provide a more reliable water supply, with diversions that are more protective for fish, in accordance with the Delta Reform Act co-equal goals of improving water supply reliability and Delta ecosystem health.</p> <p>Since the late 1800s, the Bay-Delta ecosystem has been substantially altered. Changes in key environmental attributes of the Bay-Delta have contributed to the current degraded state of the ecosystem and appear to be proximate causes of declines in desired fishes and increases in non-native species. California WaterFix is not intended to address all the factors that have contributed to the Delta's decline and briefly summarizes a few but not all of those factors. Many factors that have contributed to the decline of the Delta's ecosystem</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>including the conversion of tidal marsh and floodplains to farmland, construction of levees and altering of tide flows, in-Delta and upstream water diversions, contaminant discharges, ammonia and nutrient discharges and changes to the food web, increases in water temperatures, and introduction of non-native and invasive species. The Delta will remain in a highly altered state for the foreseeable future and the project is not intended to address all the past harms or restore the Delta to a pre-altered state.</p> <p>Please also refer to Master Response 31 (Delta Reform Act) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
3779	1	This will ruin one of California's greatest resources.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3780	1	We need clean fresh water.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3781	1	I have lived in Northern California my entire life and will not see our ecosystems destroyed for the sake of money!	<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>
3782	1	Water is precious.	The comment does not raise any issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis.
3783	1	Because I believe if you build these tunnels we will destroy the Delta and California will lose precious water. Not to mention the impact to the ecosystem and wildlife that the Delta supports.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years.
3784	1	This is not going to make more water! Do not ruin the Delta and let us make long term changes in agriculture that are sustainable.	<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>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. Please see Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need of the proposed project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via WaterFix's proposed conveyance facilities. Contractors and their customers must make economic decisions about planting in light</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			of the amounts of water they are likely to receive going forward.
3785	1	Leave our water alone.	The commenter does not raise any issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS.
3786	1	I am signing because I do not believe the tunnels are good for our environment. Our beautiful Delta brings us many things. Such as our drinking water, a place to swim, fish and boat. Why should we pay for salinity processing to have the drinking water we now have. Southern California has this problem already, keep our waterways ours. Let Southern California build those salinity plants that they need for their water. We the people of Northern California should not sacrifice our good drinking water to appease Governor Brown. Governor Brown find another way to make a name for yourself and another way to line your pockets. They have put up a rock barrier (temporary, yeah right) that has already changed the way our Delta flows. Jelly fish already. So now if we care to enjoy our Delta for recreation swimming, skiing or fishing we are risking swimming with the sharks. Oh that is right the biggest shark is our own appointed Gov. Brown. Please everyone take the time to sign to help us save our beautiful delta. #notunnels# please help save our fishing and recreation as well as our drinking water. I am from Antioch; This beautiful Delta is what has kept my family here in California.	Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria 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 45 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.
3787	1	I am signing because my family lives by the Delta and my father runs a small business on the Delta I do not think this is fair to the families that have live her in the Delta area and people that have business on the Delta or near the Delta. The tunnels will devastate those business that are family owned.	Please refer to Impact ECON-1, 5, 6, and 7 under Alternative 4A in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, for discussions of impacts related to economics.
3788	1	I think the tunnels are a terrible idea. It may benefit some but will harm so many and so much. Please do not do it!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3789	1	I do not want the Delta to become a salt marsh.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3790	1	These tunnels will devastate the California Delta; there will be salt water further up river than ever before. No environmental impact study can predict the amount of devastation they will cause.	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.
3791	1	The tunnels are a very bad idea. It will do nothing to help the drought situation in this state. It will only cost us, the tax payer, a whole lot of money we cannot afford!	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 Responses 3 and Master Responses 5.
3792	1	I want to save our fishery!	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.
3793	1	I value the Delta watershed and the proposed tunnels will decimate the Delta and farmland.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			operational flexibility.
3794	1	It does not make sense! Data does not add up. Too much money trying to push it through. Governor has been bought.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3795	1	Build water storage solutions instead.	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 Master Response 37 (Storage) for additional information.
3796	1	Keep the Delta healthy.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3797	1	The delta is all I live for. You take it only from my cold dead fingers.	The commenter does not raise any issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS.
3798	1	I am a fisherman, and I oppose the government's destruction of the natural habitat and private property.	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.
3799	1	Tunnels will destroy the right ecosystem. Government does not morally have that right especially when the voters have loudly spoken against it.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
3800	1	I am signing because I do not think Southern California and Agri-business should get Northern California water and destroy the San Joaquin River Delta and San Francisco Bay.	For a discussion of purpose and need of the California WaterFix, please refer to Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need.
3801	1	The proposed Delta tunnel project will be disastrous for our state. The impact of salt intrusion during this drought should be all of the warning we need. What is the point to continue to drain the northern part of the state to create housing and industry in the part of our state that is inhospitable to life?	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
3802	1	This initiative will further erode water resources for our state.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3803	1	This is wrong. There are better more effective ways for water problems than digging huge trenches and filling them with pipe that leak and possess a limited capacity life cycle.	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. Please refer to Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3804	1	I've grown up on the Delta, learned to fish and water-ski here. My family has been recreational fishermen for decades and to lose the San Francisco Delta-Bay region would be criminal, especially when it's being done only for money!	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (The Delta As A Place). Chapter 15 of the Final EIR addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect recreation. It describes the impacts, and discusses measures that would be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts and to compensate for significant impacts.
3805	1	I care about our Delta and am strongly opposed to anything that would compromise its quality. Northern California is getting as little rainfall as Southern California. They need to find some solutions of their own before they take more of 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. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 4 for information on the selection of alternatives.
3806	1	This [WaterFix project] will ruin the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3807	1	This is an unnecessary project that will do little to alleviate water shortages. This simply allows more water to be used for the production of non-essential crops.	<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 proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor any change in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal and State regulating agencies, ESA compliance, and project design. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods.</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>
3808	1	There would be more harm than good [from WaterFix].	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3809	1	I don't think tunnels are the answer. They would do too much permanent damage to the Delta and the environment of the entire area, not to mention the families that have been living and farming the areas for years. Taking a large portion of the fresh	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		water coming into the Delta would do a lot of permanent damage to its ecosystem.	criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), and Master Response 24 (Delta as a place).
3810	1	Because it time to use common sense. And quit giving our water up for other to waste. Let them build desalination plants	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
3811	1	These tunnels are just another political water grab. Saltwater intrusion has killed the marsh and Delta, including many species of fish. Put the water back	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.
3812	1	My grandmother raised her family in the Delta, and I have relatives and friends whose homes and livelihood are rooted in the Delta. It would be a tragedy to see these valuable farmlands, home sites, and refuges for wildlife destroyed for "massive underground water export tunnels" that add nothing to our water supply.	<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>Socioeconomic effects of the proposed project are described and assessed in Chapter 16 of the EIR/EIS. When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the proposed project. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (Delta as a place).</p>
3813	1	We are struggling with our water supply while Southern California does not have conservation programs in place. Southern California needs to show some responsibility for the water supply instead of diverting more there.	<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>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>
3814	1	Think of all the Delta farmland that will be destroyed and the salty water	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor any change in

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The EIR/EIS modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.</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>
3815	1	Environmental concerns. Don't tamper with such a sensitive ecosystem.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3816	1	I am a bass fisherman and I do not want the Delta bass fishery ruined by this.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass.
3817	1	I'm signing because I want to protect and preserve our Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3818	1	We need to stop the tunnels from being built.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3819	1	Keep my fish in the Delta no tunnels needed wait for the rain to come.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
3820	1	We need to protect our waters and save our cities and jobs. Don't ruin a beautiful area. It's already started with the "temporary" diversion wall. Let's see how long temporary really is.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3821	1	The Delta is one of the most beautiful bodies of water and I'm out there enjoying it twice a week.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3822	1	[WaterFix is a] waste of money and detriment to our lands.	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.
3823	1	I want to preserve and enhance the California Delta forever. My parents were farmers; I've lived and fished and hunted here all my life. To see this destroyed would be the biggest environmental tragedy in California history.	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.
3824	1	[I have] environmental concerns for the Delta and economic concerns for local water users in the state. The Delta is already suffering ecologically from a variety of reasons. It is widely accepted that further reducing the influx of fresh water to the Delta will further harm it and potentially lead to an ecological disaster. That is exactly what these tunnels will do. Our local environment and economy should not need to suffer to accommodate the interests of big agriculture in the southern deserts.	<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), Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Exports) and Master Response 14 (Salinity).
3825	1	These dumb tunnels will not save water or cure the drought! Desalinization plants are the way to go!	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
3826	1	There are other options like desalination plants -- let Northern California keep [our] water for our own use.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
3827	1	This is one of the greatest natural bodies of water on Earth! And this should not be changed!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3828	1	Our state legislators need to figure out another way of "fixing" California's water problems. Taking water from the Delta makes absolutely no sense. Have you heard of reservoirs?	For information regarding why water storage was not included in the proposed project, refer to Master Response 37 (Water Storage) and Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS. 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.
3829	1	This plan will devastate the natural Delta and filtration of salt intrusion; Southern California needs to develop more conservation methods [and] use desalinization to serve their growing population; let Central California continue to grow the crops to feed our nation.	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. Appendix 1C of the final EIR/EIS (Demand Management Measures) describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. Please also refer to the following: Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 14 (Salinity), Master Response 6 (Demand Management), Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply) and Master Response 7 (Desalination). Although components such as desalination plants and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the State, they are beyond the scope of the project.
3830	1	[I] don't want California to be a desert!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
3831	1	This is a bad idea, a bad plan, and the results will be disastrous. We need more water storage, not 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.
3832	1	These tunnels are going to be the destruction of the California Delta. Also, for all the people that depend on the Delta, these tunnels will be detrimental.	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.
3833	1	The tunnels will destroy an environmentally diverse ecosystem that everyone in Northern California depends on. Save the Delta! No tunnels!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
3834	1	Northern Californians need to protect our waterways and land. The tunnels will destroy our fishery and farmlands.	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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 Chapter 14 of the Final EIR/EIS (Agricultural Resources), Impact AG-1 and Impact AG-2 and their mitigation to mediate important farmland in the Delta.
3835	1	I live in Crockett. This was where the saltwater intrusion started to dissipate. Now it's east of Antioch and Rio Vista or farther this year.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
3836	1	Going on record to oppose any new tunnels being built to divert water from the Delta to Southern California.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3837	1	Bypassing water around [the] Delta is the wrong way to do it. Buy [and] retire old farms with bad soil [and] retire their water rights.	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. 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.
3838	1	This is a really lousy idea and we turned down the same proposal 33 years ago. It was a lousy idea then and it is still a bad idea.	Master Response 36 explains how the California WaterFix Project is different from the previously proposed Peripheral Canal. The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats.
3839	1	California is my home state and I don't want to see it destroyed any more than it is already.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3840	1	My family has the best time boating and enjoying the sloughs of the Delta. Tunnels will ruin a family activity that isn't affected by the drought.	Waterways throughout the Delta would still be accessible during and after construction of the proposed project.
3841	1	Damage will be done and we will be left holding the bag.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3842	1	Reducing the fresh water in the Delta will not be a benefit to any wildlife. The aquifers will not withstand salt intrusion and [will] ruin our wells. Further, thirsty Los Angeles and farmers along the pipeline will only need more and more fresh water and so this isn't the final answer to a water problem of Southern California. However, it will be a final problem for the Delta, which is [a] disaster.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply). For more information regarding salinity please see Master Response 14.
3843	1	Northern California needs water and the Delta. Southern California should build desalination plants, not twin tunnels!	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3844	1	This is ludicrous. Southern California needs to adopt permanent and strict water conservation efforts. This is a waste of our taxpayer dollars and will harm the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Appendix 1C of the final EIR/EIS (Demand Management Measures) describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. Please also refer to the following: Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 6 (Demand Management), Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply) and Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding). Although components such as desalination plants and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the State, they are beyond the scope of the project.
3845	1	Shifting Delta water to the south without providing for more surface water storage is just rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic. Let's enact a comprehensive plan that increases surface water storage and encourages desalinization. Leave the aquifer alone to recover and put a stop to the projects that will lead to increased saline levels in the Delta.	For information regarding why water storage was not included in the proposed project, refer to Master Response 37 (Water Storage) and Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS. 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. Additionally, please refer to Master Response 7 for information on desalination and why it was not included as a project alternative.
3846	1	I live near the Delta and it has over 1,000 miles of waterways for boating, etc. Moreover, it is a critical flyover stop for migrating waterfowl. As a retired wildlife ecologist, I can only relate that this area is critical for the survival of not only the waterfowl, but other bird species and wildlife that support the ecology of this area.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3846	2	The current environmental plan which is currently being reviewed would exclude many remediation issues that are extremely important to sustaining the Delta as a viable source for environmental quality. Do not support the tunnels -- the cost is beyond extravagant and only puts more of an economic burden on the state and its citizens so that a few farmers can grow crops in the desert regions of California.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), and Master Responses 5.
3847	1	The brackish water will move so far inland after these tunnels are built that it will ruin our freshwater aquatic species, ruin much of our recreation that depends on fresh water levels in the middle of the state, and ruin the agriculture-based economy that is so vital to our nation and whose revenues will be sorely missed in California. I'm sick of the short-sighted nature of this topic. Have a little vision at all, invest in tech-based solutions like desalination plants. This will be an archaic solution that will be outdated within a decade.	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 14 regarding salinity. 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 Master Response 24 for details on the Delta as a place and the impacts of the proposed project on the Delta.
3848	1	Governor Moonbeam should not be allowed to use his twin tunnel project to suck Northern California's water supply dry, just so he can send it to Southern California where his major voter supply lives. We're living in dust in Sacramento so they can water their lawns in Los Angeles. And they don't even know or care about our sacrifices, because they're not reported in Southern California anywhere. That means we're not pulling together on this as a state, and Northern California's tired of pulling the whole load. The state population has doubled in the past 40 years and they haven't built a single reservoir! And now Moonbeam wants to build these life-sucking tunnels instead? The exact opposite of what we need? Oh, my beautiful state! You're being so mismanaged.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports). Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Refer to Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply), Master Response 6 (Demand Management), and Master Response 37 (Water Storage).
3849	1	The tunnel project will draw too much water away and make the Delta an estuary with no fresh water. This will kill farming, sporting, and the salmon.	Please refer to Chapter 8, Water Quality, for a discussion of effects to water quality in the Delta. The project must meet a suite of rigorous water quality regulations in order to operate.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3850	1	We have salt water in Rio Vista that is harming the Delta; this will make it worse all so Moonbeam can line his pockets. Southern California already gets a lot of our water and does nothing but want to take more.	<p>Salinity in the Delta is a function of the amount and timing of freshwater input from the major tributaries, tidal action from San Francisco Bay, and exports from the Delta. During the late winter and spring months of seasonally elevated flows, and in wet years, seawater intrusion is limited and the Delta has mostly low salinity. During low-flow summer and fall months, and during dry years, lower freshwater flows result in greater amounts of seawater intrusion. Staff from DWR and USBR constantly monitor Delta water quality conditions and adjust operations of the SWP and CVP in real time as necessary to meet water quality objectives set by the State Water Resource Control Board protection of agricultural water supply, municipal and industrial drinking water supply, and fish and wildlife beneficial uses. See section 4.3.4 for a discussion on the proposed projects effects on water quality, salinity and electrical conductivity.</p> <p>Effects of the alternatives on salinity levels are described in Chapter 8, Water Quality, and Appendix 8H, Electrical Conductivity, EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Modeling results indicate that the implementation of the water conveyance facilities may positively or adversely affect in-Delta water quality, depending on a number of factors including location, time of year, and hydrologic conditions. See tables in Appendices 8E through 8N for specific results related to various water quality constituents (including bromide and chloride).</p> <p>In addition to potential effects associated with the project and alternatives, modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the proposed project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.</p>
3851	1	[The WaterFix] will be a disaster to the Delta and kill billions of dollars in tourist revenue and natural beauty.	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please see EIR/EIS Chapter 17 (Aesthetics/Visual Resources) for information on aesthetic impacts and mitigation.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, regarding impacts on regional economics and changes to community character.</p>
3852	1	I live here and love the beauty of this area of California: the farmland, the wildlife, and the community. The tunnels would ruin this area and the beautiful place I call home.	<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 with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
3853	1	We need to save the Delta from the rich people that want to destroy it.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3854	1	Stop destroying our natural resources in order to favor a small segment of the population.	The premise of the California WaterFix is that it will provide environmental benefits while stabilizing water supplies for a large population of California residents, consistent with statutory policy as found in the Delta Reform Act of 2009 (see, e.g., California Public Resources Code, §§ 85001(c), 85002, 85004(a), 85020.) Refer to Master Response 31 (Compliance with the Delta Reform Act).
3855	1	I don't believe the Delta needs to be fixed for the sake of a few.	The premise of the California WaterFix is that it will provide environmental benefits while stabilizing water supplies for a large population of California residents, consistent with statutory policy as found in the Delta

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Reform Act of 2009 (see, e.g., California Public Resources Code, §§ 85001(c), 85002, 85004(a), 85020.) Refer to Master Response 31 (Compliance with the Delta Reform Act).
3856	1	The Delta is an oasis for many and a living for others.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3857	1	This is where I live. My family enjoys the outdoors here and the quality of life that we have here on the Delta. This should not be a propaganda of politicians.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3858	1	I care about our Delta. The tunnels are shortsighted and wrong.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3859	1	Governor Brown is an idiot and the tunnels are a money grab that should not be.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3860	1	This project would have extremely detrimental effects on human health in the Elk Grove area and to the Delta ecosystem. Land that has been in families for over a century will be taken and flooded. Jeffersonians unite!	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. Socioeconomic effects of the proposed project are described and assessed in Chapter 16 of the EIR/EIS. When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the proposed project.
3861	1	I believe in a healthy San Francisco Bay-Delta ecosystem now and forever!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3862	1	Don't let Northern California die off because you want to send our water to the southern region.	Please refer to Master Response 26 (Effects on Northern California) and 35 (MWD Water Supply).
3863	1	Save the Delta for locals.	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.
3864	1	Oppose the twin tunnels boondoggle. An environmental mess.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
3865	1	These tunnels are not the "Fix". Destroying an ecosystem is not the "Fix." Stop all water flows from the Delta so it can repair itself and build desalination plants up and down the coast. This is the "Fix."	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need. Additionally, please refer to Master Response 7 for information on desalination and why it was not included as a project alternative.
3866	1	Save the Delta from ruin.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3867	1	I believe the amount of extraction of fresh water from the Sacramento River would have hugely detrimental effects on the estuary and San Francisco Bay.	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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>
3868	1	Taking water from the Delta on such a massive scale was a bad idea in 1982 and it's an even worse idea now. Our goal should be to more efficiently use the water we have, not to take more and continue our wasteful practices.	Master Response 36 explains how the California WaterFix Project is different from the previously proposed Peripheral Canal. The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats.
3869	1	The Delta is home to so much wildlife and putting giant tunnels in will destroy everything the Delta is about.	<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>
3870	1	Not thinking is what has gotten us into this mess; we need smart solutions to get us out of this. We don't need to destroy nature even more than we already have.	<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>
3871	1	If California knew it was a bad idea in the '80s, then the idea is not any better now. Furthermore, build desalinization plants instead to get water from the ocean! It's the largest water supply in the world; it just needs to be tapped now!	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
3872	1	I don't believe the tunnels will solve our water problem. Messing with nature on this large of a scale will be worse for all of us in the long run. Move some of the farms growing roses and grass in a drought to other states if they don't have water that I just drove past in Bakersfield (we are in a drought, right?). After all mine is dead in my	Since the late 1800s, the Bay-Delta ecosystem has been substantially altered. Changes in key environmental attributes of the Bay-Delta have contributed to the current degraded state of the ecosystem and appear to be proximate causes of declines in desired fishes and increases in non-native species. California WaterFix is not intended to address all the factors that have contributed to the Delta's decline and briefly summarizes a

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		front yard. And for the lush lawns in Southern California, let those die too. Need more drinking water? Buy some bottled water like I do since the quality of my tap water is undrinkable already and would only get worse as the water table dropped.	<p>few but not all of those factors. Many factors that have contributed to the decline of the Delta's ecosystem including the conversion of tidal marsh and floodplains to farmland, construction of levees and altering of tide flows, in-Delta and upstream water diversions, contaminant discharges, ammonia and nutrient discharges and changes to the food web, increases in water temperatures, and introduction of non-native and invasive species. The Delta will remain in a highly altered state for the foreseeable future and the project is not intended to address all the past harms or restore the Delta to a pre-altered state.</p> <p>It is important to note, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 (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>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. Please see Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need of the proposed project.</p>
3873	1	The tunnels are a horribly bad idea and will result in saltwater intrusion which would decimate the wildlife dependent on fresh water, ruin Delta farmers and have a negative impact on an environment that has drawn boaters from the Valley to the Bay to our beautiful Delta. Also, why would [Governor] Brown's PR people have to label this as the opposite of what it actually is, twin tunnels, in order to give it any chance of passing in a vote?	<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 14 (Salinity).</p>
3874	1	The almond industry uses too much water. It is time for nut farmers to switch to a more sustainable product.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). The proposed project would not increase the amount of water to which SWP and CVP hold water rights for use allowed under their contracts and</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			permits and approvals for refuge water supplies or other environmental purposes.
3875	1	The ecology and animals that need this water to survive are more important than the money big agriculture makes. The priority is saving our planet, not greed.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
3876	1	I live in the Delta. I support agriculture as well as wildlife preservation.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3877	1	The tunnels will destroy the Delta ecosystem.	<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>
3878	1	[The WaterFix] is a stupid idea. This will totally upset the ecological balance of the Delta, the Bay, maybe the state.	<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>
3879	1	The tunnels are a terrible idea. If and when California gets serious about water issues, there are better ways to address them.	<p>It is important to note, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. Please see Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need of the proposed project.</p> <p>Although many of the proposed alternatives included meritorious water policy principles, the proposals rejected by the Lead Agencies did not qualify as appropriate alternatives for various reasons. For example, proposals were rejected because they were inconsistent with the project's objectives and purpose and need</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			or included components that are beyond the scope of the project. The text of the Draft EIR/EIS in Chapter 3 (section 3.2) and Appendix 3A to that document thoroughly explain the process used to develop the alternatives, and explain why certain potential alternatives were considered but ultimately rejected by the Lead Agencies. (Master Response 4 [Alternatives]).
3880	1	Change California agricultural policy to save our water.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via proposed conveyance facilities.
3881	1	A massive tunnel project could only further endanger the Delta. This proposal should be discarded now.	<p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. The premise of the California WaterFix is that it will provide environmental benefits while stabilizing water supplies for a large population of California residents, consistent with statutory policy as found in the Delta Reform Act of 2009 (see, e.g., California Public Resources Code, §§ 85001(c), 85002, 85004(a), 85020.) Refer to Master Response 31 (Compliance with the Delta Reform Act).</p> <p>Please also refer to Master Response 4 (Tunnel Option).</p>
3882	1	I wholeheartedly oppose these tunnels that will forever negatively affect the environmental balance of the Delta!	<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>
3883	1	Use all our recycled water first.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3884	1	This would cause a devastating environmental impact on the San Francisco Bay-Delta area.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3885	1	This is not a fix. It is a diversion. It will not give California more water, it just takes water from somewhere viable that needs it and gives it to someone else. Think of a water creating alternative, not a water stealing one.	<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. In response to public input, several new alternatives have been studied in the Recirculated DEIR/EIS and a new preferred Alternative (4A) identified.</p>
3885	1	We must protect this unique resource and there are other ways to provide water that would be safer while providing job opportunities. Please pursue these alternatives.	<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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			carefully considered all potential alternatives that were proposed during the scoping process and during time of preparation of the Draft EIR/EIS. In response to public input, several new alternatives have been studied in the Recirculated DEIR/EIS and a new preferred Alternative (4A) identified.
3886	1	This is a very poor strategy and neither a short-term nor long-term solution. The proposal has dire consequences for the short-term and unforeseen domino effects for the long-term.	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.
3888	1	This is the same plan as last time. It will destroy what is there. We have messed up the State, let's not totally ruin it.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3889	1	California's pride, the San Francisco Bay-Delta should not be altered by political means. This natural ecological and native wonder must be left alone.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3890	1	I live in Northern California. Southern California is a desert. I believe they should realize that and take steps to limit new housing, encourage desert-living water conservation and restrict agricultural water use in the Central Valley by planting crops that are more appropriate to the area and dry farming others.	The proposed project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies needed to meet California's overall water management needs. It is not a substitute for increased commitments to other water supply solutions, including recycling, desalination, water conservation and storage. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3891	1	The Delta Tunnel proposal is insane! All around bad idea.	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.
3892	1	These tunnels will drastically change the beautiful Sacramento Delta. It is an irresponsible use of land and water for big unsustainable agriculture.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
3893	1	Corruption and greed need to stop and we need to start focusing on better solutions, not what is best for our pockets!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3895	1	This is my home. Leave what is left of the beautiful surroundings alone!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3896	1	I oppose this multi-million dollar boondoggle!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3897	1	Save our Delta and fish.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3898	1	I believe it is best to save the San Francisco Bay-Delta and find other ways to find 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.
3899	1	I am concerned about the impact on the ecology of the region and am interested in supporting projects that create local jobs and enhance water sustainability for California's future.	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. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report was published, which indicated that the proposed project would result in a substantial economic net benefit to California, including local jobs creation.
3900	1	This is just another water grab instead of actually fixing water shortage problems. To transfer fixes nothing!	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.
3901	1	Keep the water in the Sacramento River.	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.
3902	1	This will ruin another body of water that is so valuable to our local economy and the wildlife that live here. Please stop this nonsense.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3903	1	Save our Delta and stop Westlands!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3904	1	I revere the San Francisco Bay Delta. It is a necessary part of the natural habitat.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3905	1	This is a dangerous and stupid idea,	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3906	1	The San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary supports life, both human and wild, and an ill-conceived plan like this will destroy too much; it will not even benefit the entrenched powers who want it, not in the long term.	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.
3907	1	The San Joaquin Valley desperately depends on our Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3908	1	I am tired of our Delta being threatened so that millions of people can live and farm in a place with limited water resources of their own. You are asking our farmers to compromise their livelihood so that farmers further south can survive and that is unfair.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. In its efforts to achieve the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration, the California WaterFix seeks to protect dozens of species of fish and wildlife in the Delta while also securing reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California. Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed California WaterFix.
3909	1	I oppose spending the money to deplete the Delta. The money should be spent on water conservation projects.	As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. 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). Please refer to Master Response 5.
3910	1	Tunnels redirecting water from the Delta would destroy this special resource.	For information on how the project could affect fish, and wildlife, please see Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Species, and Chapter 12, Terrestrial Biological Resources.
3911	1	The San Joaquin River Delta is the largest remaining wetlands for native bird and fish species in California. The creation of the Delta tunnels is the government bowing to large agri-business agendas in Bakersfield, etc. More efficient water diversion to Southern California for unsustainable agriculture is not what California needs! Help protect California's wetlands and defend the idea that government is for the people's interests.	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. The project was initiated by former Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, who was twice elected by a majority of California voters. The process has continued under the administration of his successor, Edmund G. Brown,

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Jr. Hence, the project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole. (see Master Response 3 [Purpose and Need])</p> <p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. The documentation generated by this proposed project has undergone extensive public and scientific input, discussion, and transparency, including the posting of administrative draft chapters online and providing many more opportunities for public participation than is normally required by the CEQA/NEPA processes (see Master Response 41 [Transparency]).</p>
3912	1	Stop the giveaway of our water to the oil and agriculture multinational corporations!	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.
3913	1	This is a water grab. Put the \$2 billion into dams and water storage.	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
3914	1	I hope to inspire East Contra Costa residents to be more eco-centric than ego-centric and to speak up for the environment that our lives and well-being ultimately depend on.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3915	1	These harmful tunnels must be stopped.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3916	1	I want the Delta saved! No water tunnels!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3917	1	Delta Tunnels are a bad idea for the environment, for farming, for fishing and for California in general!	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 Chapter 14 of the Final EIR/EIS (Agricultural Resources), Impact AG-1 and Impact AG-2 and

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			their mitigation to mediate important farmland in the Delta.
3918	1	This proposal is just wrong, period! Governor Brown is in the pocketbooks of big money water moguls who for 60 years have tried to rape the water from the California Delta for personal gain without regards to the Delta's ecosystem. This proposal fixes nothing other than continuing to stuff the pockets of those like Governor Brown involved with moving and selling the Delta's water for personal gain.	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.
3919	1	It is not the right thing to do for the Delta. It will hurt the Delta system and the life that thrives on it from fish, birds, beavers, geese, ducks and plants.	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. See Chapter 11 of the Final EIR/EIS for impacts and mitigation for Aquatic Resources and Chapter 12 for impacts and mitigation for Terrestrial Resources.
3920	1	I have enjoyed the tremendous waterways of the Delta and do not want to chance their destruction.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3921	1	I lived by Delta country for many years. Do not risk this.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3922	1	There will be a major effect on fish and game businesses, tourist and residential sectors. I am against this 110%.	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.
3923	1	Anybody living from Matinez east would be severely impacted, not to mention the people from the western/central Delta. There are many better options. Dump this whole thing. It is like a nightmare.	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.
3924	1	The Tunnels will ruin the Delta. Build desalination plants!	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
3925	1	I believe the current plan only benefits the Southern California water companies.	For more information regarding Southern California Water Supply please see Master Response 35. 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.
3926	1	There needs to be a great deal more environmental impact studies done to justify these expensive and potentially threatening projects. In Southern California, Poseidon Company of San Diego is trying to push through desalination plants at 700+ million each in many coastal cities, of which it is called "society (long- term) bears the risk, and Wall Street bears the rewards. The head of California Ocean Conservancy says we have not done enough conservation yet, and I agree. Let us look into new ways of doing things (government tax incentives for waterless urinals in commercial properties, for example), before we assume that we need more water redistribution because of 100 year old thinking styles.	<p>Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives (such as desalination) that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project. However, nothing in the proposed project would prevent other entities from pursuing innovative approaches to desalination or other water supply solutions. As described in Appendix 3A, Section 3A.7, Results of Initial Screening of Conveyance Alternatives, EIR/EIS (2013), desalination was included as part of Alternative B7. Issues related to desalination include land use impacts, costs, and substantial energy use requirements. Advances in technology have improved feasibility of desalination and as a statewide water use planning component; it will be evaluated by water agencies on a local/regional level.</p> <p>Desalination, the process of removing salt and other minerals from seawater to make it suitable for drinking or irrigation, is being implemented in several California communities. However, it has not proven viable to secure adequate water supplies to meet California's needs due to high costs and energy demands.</p> <p>Today, desalination creates an estimated 84,000 acre-feet of potable water a year in the state, mostly</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>through treatment of brackish groundwater, which is less salty and cheaper to treat than sea water. In comparison, the proposed project would secure an estimated 4.7 to 5.2 million acre-feet of water to supply more than 25 million people and 3 million acres of farmland.</p> <p>Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Local water agencies will need to invest in additional strategies and technologies, including desalination, to meet future water demand.</p> <p>The proposed project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies needed to meet California's overall water management needs. It is not a substitute for increased commitments to other water supply solutions, including recycling, desalination, water conservation and storage.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding desalination.</p>
3927	1	It is part of our duty as human beings that we take care of our environment, both for us and our children. Please help us fulfill responsibility. Thank you.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3928	1	I am a bass fisherman on the Delta and these tunnels will ruin this great fishery.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.
3929	1	It is plain and simple stop the tunnels and save the Delta. The Delta is there to enjoy not be destroyed.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3930	1	These type of water redistribution would devastate the San Francisco Bay.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3931	1	Public policy should not be dictated by Agribusiness corporation, especially when it threatens the environment. We also need legislation that ends the growing of water intensive crops for export.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3932	1	Recycling is great. Except when it is the recycling of poor concepts and bad, previously rejected ideas. Drop the Delta Tunnels project. One moderate quake would wipe them out anyway.	Please refer to the response to comment letter 566, comment number 10.
3933	1	Governor Brown: stop fracking. Oil uses 30%+ and makes all that water poison. Fracking violates every EPA Standard ever passed. Just because Cheney made them exempt, does not justify allowing that much damage to the state. Southern California-build desalination plants. Stop stealing water from the north. It is killing the	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Delta.	
3934	1	There are other more sustainable options for the water emergency in California. We need to be creative and think about the long term impact on all beings, not just what is best for humans. Humans are only part of the equation. If we upset ecosystems we damage overall health for the adjacent areas to this tunnel project and Earth overall. We need to live in harmony with nature and take only what is needed to support life. Balance, the delicate balance, needs to be maintained. Get more options to create better solutions. Think macro effect not micro effect.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives.
3935	1	Get a grip on reality! Unsustainable agriculture has to stop!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
3936	1	This is not a good solution to anything, especially Northern California. Please sign. California voters already said "no" once.	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.
3937	1	I do not want more destruction and manipulation of our already basically man-made state.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3938	1	We need to come up with different ways of reusing and conserving water instead of taking from the Delta. The tunnels would be disastrous and are illogical. Leave the Delta alone!	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. 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.
3939	1	I want to help preserve the San Francisco Bay estuary from being destroyed more than it already has been.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3940	1	It is appalling that a project like this is being encouraged when it could have such awful effects on this fragile area. It is just too risky to proceed with this tunnel plan. Please stop now! Thank you.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3941	1	The Delta, fish and local environment are more important than cities and big ag that suck and waste water. No, no, no.	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. The project does not increase the

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water) and Master Response 6 (Demand Management).
3942	1	Do not destroy nor endanger our water, native plants, animals nor our lives! Stop the tunnels!	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.
3943	1	In our opinion, a better solution to Southern California's water problems would be to recycle all of Southern California's waste water.	While water storage is a critically important tool for managing California's water resources, it is not a topic that must be addressed in the EIR/EIS for the proposed project. This is because the proposed project does not, and need 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 purposes of CEQA and NEPA, just as future storage projects would be. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, of the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the development of alternatives. Please see Master Response 6 for information on Demand Management. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
3944	1	I'm signing because we need to keep our health safe, our environment safe, and our water safe.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3945	1	I am strongly against water diversion.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3946	1	Pulling more water out of the Delta is not a solution for Southern California to the drought. We need more storage and more innovative methods of desalinization and water recovery.	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. Additionally, please refer to Master Response 63 for information on desalination and why it was not included as a project alternative.
3947	1	I'm signing because destroying our ecosystems for the sake of short term economic gains is foolish and immoral. We need to concentrate on living within our means and using our vast resources of creativity and intellect to come up with long term solutions.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 4 (Alternatives) and Master Response 6 (Demand Management).
3948	1	The Delta is the center of the state. If it collapses, we all do.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3949	1	This plan is bad for the people and the land and will have many negative results.	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
3950	1	This is a foolish waste of taxpayer money!	<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.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p>
3951	1	Do not destroy our natural resources for the short money.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3952	1	Is this project viable with the environment, economically and with the residents?	<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. Not all of the residents are in favor of the project. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
3953	1	The Delta tunnels will seriously degrade the wetlands of the San Francisco Bay Delta, a nationally-important wetland. The State of California should not provide corporate welfare to agriculture at the permanent cost to the nation. It is time for growers to accept the climate is changing and they cannot grow water-intensive crops in a desert.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
3954	1	I am deeply concerned about the impact on the Delta fishery caused by the tunnels.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.
3955	1	We need balanced sustainable solutions.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.
3956	1	Ag business is not about healthy eating it is about profits. People and the economy first. Not the 1%.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3957	1	I am opposed to corporations having their way with the environment that we all share with no regard for sustainability. We should not be diverting water that is supposed to support vast natural ecosystems for the purpose of growing water intensive crops during a drought that are then sent overseas. All Californians should be protecting our unique natural geography and its inherent ecosystems--especially our Governor!	The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via California WaterFix proposed conveyance facilities and Master Response 26 for additional discussion regarding exports and water rights.
3958	1	This was a very bad idea in the 70s that we collectively opposed and defeated in 1982, 32 years ago! But it is a "zombie" coming back in a revised but no better an idea now as it was back then! No, no, no!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 36 (Peripheral Canal) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
3959	1	It is a water grab for corporate farmers.	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.
3960	1	Stupid choice. Do not mess with Mother Nature.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3961	1	They want to take fresh water from the estuary to grow nuts? Forget it! Native animals, including humans, need it.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). The proposed project would not increase the amount of water to which SWP and CVP hold water rights for use allowed under their contracts and permits and approvals for refuge water supplies or other environmental purposes.</p>
3962	1	Southern California already receives unsustainable water supplies. Enough!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
3963	1	I'm sick of rich and powerful bullies whose only reason to exist is money. They will pave the [expletive deleted] world if we just sit on our [expletive deleted] and let them!	<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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Response 45 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.
3964	1	Northern California's Delta estuary does not have more water to give to Southern California. Our precious, unique Delta needs more fresh water outflow not less! Once it's destroyed there will be no turning back! Desalinization is the only way Southern California should be able to get more fresh water!	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
3965	1	This project will ruin the Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3966	1	The water situation in the San Francisco Bay Area is far too delicate to permit such a huge diversion of the Sacramento River. Let the San Joaquin farmers do without that water and let California and the world do without the ag products that water would support. Get the nuts out of California.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
3967	1	This plan will add no water. In fact, with climate change and less snow cap, there will be even less water in the Delta. Building the twin tunnels to send water into dryer areas will devastate Northern California farmers. It will destroy the natural beauty of the Delta and cause irreversible environmental harm.	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. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26. Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods.
3967	2	A similar plan, the "Peripheral Canal" has been proposed for decades and has been voted down by the people. Forcing such a project through against the will of the people is a crime. This is a wrong-headed solution to California's water problem.	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. Please refer to Master Response 36 for information regarding how the proposed project differs from the peripheral canal.
3968	1	The tunnels are not conducive to the health of the California Bay Delta. Tunnels are an expensive Band-Aid! This is far from a permanent solution.	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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).
3969	1	I am sick of corporations and politicians destroying our environment and wasting our tax dollars on boondoggles.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria 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 and oil companies). 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. Refer to Master Response 45 (Purpose and Need) and Master Responses 38 and 39 (cost and funding, respectively).
3970	1	The tunnels will destroy the Delta - one of California's most valuable ecosystems and recreational waterways. There are alternatives to the tunnels, to include conservation and the elimination of for profit agriculture, that will save the Delta and cost less.	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. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 34 for additional details on the determination of beneficial use.
3971	1	The Delta is an important ecosystem.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
3972	1	Yet another very expensive "fix" that won't work.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding).
3973	1	The tunnels are a bad idea. Will kill the Delta and never pay for itself.	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.
3974	1	Preserving large, significant areas of our environment is essential to our long- term survival.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3975	1	I want to make sure that our local economy welfare is sustainable.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. As described in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, under Alternative 4, Impact ECON-1, construction employment is estimated to peak at 2,427 FTE jobs in year 3. Total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) would peak in year 12, at 8,673 FTE jobs. Direct agricultural employment would be reduced by an estimated 16 FTE jobs, while total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) associated with agricultural employment would fall by 57 FTE jobs. Because construction of water conveyance facilities would result in an increase in construction-related employment and labor income, this would be considered a beneficial effect.
3976	1	The problems that are created by over-use of available resources will not be justified in the long run or the greater good.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3977	1	I'm signing because I want red-leaning Central Valley farmers who are massively subsidized by north state water to look in the mirror and cut off their own welfare! I want to stop exporting increasingly limited California water to the rest of the planet via corporate ag exports. Let's not do yet another sequel to Chinatown, i.e., the Owens Valley water raid. I'm signing because I'm exasperated with Southern California pols washing their cars several times a week!	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p> <p>Under the stringent environmental statutes in place today, including the Endangered Species Act, operation of the proposed water delivery system could not drain the Delta rivers and channels dry, including the Sacramento River. The proposed project's facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants, would be operated in accordance with permits issued by, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the State Water Resources Control Board, among other agencies. The proposed project would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).</p>
3978	1	Protect scarce water resources and a unique and precious ecosystem.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3979	1	The environment is our most important problem now and once we destroy it we can never go back.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3980	1	The Bay Delta is one of the most beautiful places in California and it needs to be protected, ergo, it doesn't need tunnels! I am in total opposition to the Delta Tunnels; not only will they make things worse, they will negatively impact people, wildlife, and farmland.	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.
3981	1	I'm signing because I oppose short-sighted measures and support environmentally sound ones. Big Ag needs to re-examine its methods and over-reach. We all need to find better alternatives to massive systems overgrowth.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. The Lead Agencies do not have land use/zoning authority to control development or "big ag". See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water). Appendix 3A of the Draft EIR/EIS describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered. Appendix 1B describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. While these elements are not part of the project, they are important tools in managing California's water resources.
3982	1	Our water quality is getting worse every year.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
3983	1	Enough with the *Water Grabs*. These are like the Land Grabs of the 19th Century.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports) and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
3984	1	I live near and fish and recreate in the Delta. I have seen the steady decline in the Delta since 1998 when they began their increases in water transported south into the aqueducts. These tunnels will only increase the rate of decline.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
3985	1	I am signing this because the priorities are all wrong. To take fresh potable water to grow products that are not essential to live on while overlooking other projects that directly help thirsty Californians is a travesty. People can survive just fine without the water intensive crops, but they cannot survive without water.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
3986	1	This is the wrong plan and will harm the largest estuary in the west. There are better water plans for California that will meet the needs of everyone rather than pushing the this massive project which will benefit a few.	The proposed project is one component, among many, of the California Water Action Plan. In its efforts to achieve the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration, the project seeks to protect dozens of species of fish and wildlife in the Delta while also securing reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California. The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/ . By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta 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. Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7 regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage. Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project and Master Response 35 regarding Southern California water supply.
3987	1	The tunnels will destroy the precious fresh water estuary in California. It will not fix the drought. We need storage and desalination.	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.
3988	1	This is a bad idea, another government boondoggle; a new way to benefit big political contributors at the general public's expense. It is a mistake and not in the best interests of the state of California.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3989	1	One of the worst plans I have heard. How about charge Los Angeles for the water we give them and limit the amount to them by half! Then we would not need to build the tunnels and we would have water. Also Los Angeles is extremely wasteful of water and new parks filled with water thirsty plants!? Cut them off. Save our Delta. Keep our water here!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
3989	2	Instead of fining the people for infractions of water use since most of us use 80% less water already. Fine cities and parks that leave their water on all day and night letting it flood down the streets! I can go on and on but the people in charge of this issue (Politicians) have their head so far up their own asses they would not be able to hear me anyway.	This comment is outside the scope of the proposed project. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies needed to meet California's overall water management needs. It is not a substitute for increased commitments to other water supply solutions, including recycling, desalination, water conservation and storage. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management.
3990	1	I live in the Delta and appreciate its natural beauty. And the tunnels will not solve the water problem it will only increase the volume of water leaving the Delta and destroying a natural habitats for many resident species in the Delta. The overall cost of building the tunnels will burden future generations with the debt which will probably be 5-10 times the initial cost estimate.	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. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Costs and Funding).
3991	1	I strongly feel the tunnels plan would be devastating to the ecology and the economy in the Bay-Delta region nor enhance water sustainability for the future.	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.
3992	1	Water is so precious. There is a limit, however, to how much can be diverted away from where it replenishes the estuary. I do not know that answer. I am only signing on to raise greater awareness about the delta estuary. The actual amount of diverted water would have to be decided on by biologist and agricultural experts.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3993	1	What are you thinking? Stop this now! How could you Jerry!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3994	1	This is a ridiculous use of funds. This should go to fixing California infrastructure (roads) or new tech to bring new water supplies to California such as storage and reverse osmosis, not switch and bait Delta water to south valley growers.	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.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>In addition to the added water management flexibility created by new water diversions and operational scenarios, the project would improve habitat, increase food supplies and reduce the effects of other stressors on the Delta ecosystem.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. All of the documents, studies, administrative drafts, and meeting materials have been posted online since 2010 in an unprecedented commitment to public access and government transparency (Please see Master Response 41 [Transparency]).</p>
3995	1	The Delta Tunnels are a water grab, that is politically motivated, and the cost of implementation is not a good use of tax dollars.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
3996	1	I oppose the twin tunnel project because water diverted away from the Delta only brings in salt water. This is a farming state and crops cannot be grown with salt 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.
3996	2	Water rights holders in southern California are selling their water rights to other states and to Mexico. We need to keep the water from Northern California in Northern California to support our growing population and farming.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
3997	1	I am signing this because this is obviously a bad idea. Why in the world would you put more of the environment in danger to solve a problem? It seems to me that a more permanent solution should be explored. You can't put a Band-Aid on a bullet wound so why would you do this?	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.
3998	1	This latest renamed boondoggle produces not one drop of new water and just continues the theft of our most valuable natural resource by Southern California water barons. The same amount of money could build 75-100 reverse osmosis water plants along the state coastal areas that produce 50,000,000 gallons of drinkable water from the sea per plant! What am I missing?	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
3999	1	This project does nothing we are very short of in the first place to bring more water to California.	<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>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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			exported supplies. The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change with continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).