

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
400	1	The time is long overdue for the State of California to build an ocean water filtration plant to supply the cities of Southern California with 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.
401	1	I am concerned about the decision makers who make the call over how to proceed with the Delta project.  The Delta is a very important natural area, an estuary for wildlife and fauna.  I sincerely hope you consider all measures in the best interest of everyone involved.  Not only short sighted cash but long lasting environmental friendly ideas should be applied.	Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.  DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.
402	1	Here is the information regarding the documents I need for LAND [Local Agencies of the North Delta]'s review of the RDEIR/EIS.  (1) Technical backup documents described below for comments on Air Quality chapter.  (2) EIR/EIS References. I understand this information is at the DWR West Sacramento office, but was hoping that I might obtain the complete information electronically on disk (or maybe through a document sharing link).  (3) March 2013 USACE white paper entitled "BDCP: Permit Application Approach for CM-1." It is referenced on p. ES-2 of the RDEIR/EIS, but does not appear to be listed as a reference.	DWR has provided the material requested by the commenter. Regarding the USACE white paper reference, no such reference appears in the RDEIR/SDEIS Executive Summary.
402	2	[ATT1: Petra Pless letter to Osha Mserve, requesting additional WaterFix documents.]	This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
403	1	Save California for our future!!!	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.  The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
404	1	Per unep.org study 50% of all reservoir water evaporates!  Exceeding consumption since 1922!  Time for tank storage.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.  The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
405	1	As a now half-century experienced [International] Community Development/Applied Appropriate Technology Consultant, [I am] suggesting that we now have the technological abilities to aggressively, efficiently, [and] cost-effectively deal with our drought problems [and] needs.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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>
406	1	Just a quick question.... How does California Water Fix help reduce reliance on Delta imports as mandated by the 2009 Delta Reform Act?	Appendix G of the RDEIR/SDEIS addresses consistency with the Delta Plan, including reliance on the Delta for water supply. As explained in Appendix G, the State promotes demand management measures to reduce the state's need for exporting water to the Delta. Please also refer to Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures and Master Response 6, related to demand management as well as Master Response 31 (Compliance with Delta Reform Act).
407	1	The state has already [proven] they [cannot] maintain prior projects throughout the state. With the levees not being properly maintained, how is putting two massive tunnels below ground, which [are] harder to maintain, going to be any different? I will tell you it [will not] be any different. The government is just going to ask the tax-paying citizens like myself to foot the bill to put in such an atrocity, then in 10 years ask us to foot the bill for another atrocious way to steal water because the last plan [did not] work as they [did not] maintain what they promised they would because they are too busy putting the taxpayers' money in their own and friends' pockets, aka the water districts 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. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding).
408	1	Will the state conduct a full cost-benefit analysis of the project that includes the value of freshwater to the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary?	DWR is revising the Socioeconomic Impact Analysis for the project based on changes included in the RDEIR/SDEIS. An updated cost-benefit analysis will be prepared outside of the CEQA/NEPA process.
410	1	The California WaterFix does not appear to address my concerns. I live in Contra Costa County. We get our water from the San Joaquin Delta. When the California WaterFix takes freshwater away before it arrives in the delta, the Delta will necessarily become more brackish. Additionally, the tunnels will cost an enormous amount of money and not solve any of California's long-term water problems.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>Water delivered to the SWP and CVP water contractors participating in proposed project would be within the existing contract amounts to serve agricultural lands that have been cultivated and existing and planned community populations, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply. The proposed project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply.</p> <p>The EIR/S modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.</p> <p>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).</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>
410	2	Our biggest problems are likely to be related to climate change. We are experiencing a drought with a particularly low level of snow pack in the Sierras. We don't know how long California will have a low level of snow pack, but some models suggest it could last many years. Scientists seem to be more certain that global warming will cause sea level rise. In	The proposed project would actually provide additional resiliency and adaptability in the face of rising sea level as described in Chapter 29 of the DEIR/S.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		your report, I read that sea level was expected to rise more than 4 feet, which would make the Delta a poor place to gather water.	
410	3	It appears that hundreds of millions of dollars are being spent to plan to spend tens of billions of dollars to install tunnels that will transfer an increasing amount from a decreasing supply of water. I don't see any investment in a long term solution. In my view, a long term solution must include desalination. That is the only way I have heard suggested to increase the water supply, rather than fight over the existing supply.	DWR acknowledges your opposition to the project. The project would cost approximately \$15 billion to build. Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on the costs of project implementation.
410	4	In a state with a limited water supply, it would seem prudent to prioritize water usage. The lion's share of the water is used for agriculture. I understand the importance of agriculture. However, I don't understand why the state appears to be encouraging companies to invest in nut trees, which are reputed to require profligate water use. The state could limit the agricultural water usage by setting limits based on acreage. This would encourage conservation rather than inefficient watering of water-hungry nut trees.  In short, I think the California WaterFix is expensive and short-sighted and I am disappointed that, after all of the effort that has gone into studying its effects, politicians are still pursuing it.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The SWP and CVP operations under the action alternatives would only deliver water under existing water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board to DWR and Reclamation for use by the SWP and CVP. 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.
411	1	I am 100% opposed to these tunnels. They will ultimately be used to ship additional water south. I would rather see the money be used for desalination/water reuse/recovery projects, additional storage or intelligent negotiations with the northwest states and Canada/Alaska to import excess supply for a price.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
412	1	I object to the diversion of water from the San Joaquin River Delta to central and southern California. The proposed tunnels are not sound economically or ecologically. The rivers don't have enough water to supply vast deserts and support their own ecosystems. California's natural hydrologic resources -- its coasts, rivers, marshes, wetlands, and lakes are at ever higher risk from human factors. These tunnels would encourage further unsustainable urban and agricultural development in areas with no life-sustaining resources of their own at the expense of what is essentially America's Fertile Crescent. Don't ruin our beautiful state, waste our tax dollars, or allow your name to be run through the mud with this shameful, poorly planned and ultimately futile attempt to take water from Peter to pay Paul. Invest instead in building desalination plants, cleaning up underground aquifers, and recycling wastewater. Learn from the drought: tunnels are not the answer.	Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.  DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.
418	1	Building tunnels in the Delta is going to ruin the water quality and destroy agriculture such as pear farmers who have been growing for generations. A better idea is to take 298,000 acres out of production in the Westland Water District. These acres have poor drainage and are toxic according to ECONorthwest. Please see the article in the East Bay Express July 22, 2015, An Alternative to the Tunnels. The tunnels are not the answer -- there will be no quality of life if they are built.	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 or what types of agricultural practices are used, nor do they have the authority to regulate land uses in areas where such practices take place. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via BDCP proposed conveyance facilities.
419	1	I oppose the Peripheral Tunnel plan. But here is an alternative plan that would cost far less, be equally effective, and FAR less destructive:  Build a permanent salt-water barrier in the Carquinez Strait.	For more information regarding how the proposed project differs from the peripheral canals please see Master Response 36. 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>This barrier would solve all of the issues:</p> <p>a) No salt-water intrusion east of the barrier.</p> <p>b) No fear of salt intrusion due to levee failure</p> <p>c) No fear of salt intrusion due to sea level rise.</p> <p>The barrier would have controllable gates to allow for marine traffic and allow management during varying conditions.</p> <p>The barrier would have extensive fish ladders.</p> <p>The barrier would cost far less than the tunnels.</p> <p>The barrier would allow reliable export of available water.</p> <p>The barrier would improve the Delta ecology and its agriculture.</p> <p>The barrier would have far greater popular support.</p> <p>Please consider this option in lieu of the peripheral tunnels.</p>	<p>allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.</p> <p>For more information regarding cost please see Master Response 5.</p>
419	2	<p>I have a suggestion that I think bears real consideration regarding the Delta water discussions that are now being looked at.</p> <p>The key issue seems to be insuring the quality of the fresh water that is pumped from the Delta, specifically, protecting against salt-water intrusion during limited periods of time associated with occasional levee ruptures.</p> <p>Such ruptures are inevitable regardless of levee protection measures. History indicates such.</p> <p>Salt-water intrusion may occur until the "island" where the levee has failed fills with water. This is because there is a temporary inrush of water into the island that may be strong enough to pull some salty bay water "uphill" during certain brief conditions such as high tide. However, as soon as the water level stabilizes within the flooded "island", that "suction" fully disappears and the intrusion risk is completely eliminated, returning the situation to normal. And, since the Delta continually flows towards the ocean, any intrusion is flushed and diluted rather rapidly.</p> <p>If aqueduct pumping is temporarily stopped during the brief levee failure crisis period until the "stabilization" occurs, salt-water infiltration can be significantly mitigated; perhaps even stopped. Nevertheless, it may be desirable to create positive "check-valve" on the Bay's salt water that can be deployed when required.</p> <p>Solution:</p> <p>Install a "backflow preventer" in the river at Pittsburg. This would be similar to the tidal gates now being used in Europe. These would only be deployed during levee failure emergencies and would prevent saltwater intrusion until the flooding of an "island" is stabilized. This would be relatively cheap and completely non-obtrusive when not being deployed.</p>	<p>Salinity in the Delta is a function of the amount and timing of freshwater input from the major tributaries, tidal action from San Francisco Bay, and exports from the Delta. During the late winter and spring months of seasonally elevated flows, and in wet years, seawater intrusion is limited and the Delta has mostly low salinity. During low-flow summer and fall months, and during dry years, lower freshwater flows result in greater amounts of seawater intrusion. Staff from DWR and USBR constantly monitor Delta water quality conditions and adjust operations of the SWP and CVP in real time as necessary to meet water quality objectives set by the State Water Resource Control Board protection of agricultural water supply, municipal and industrial drinking water supply, and fish and wildlife beneficial uses. See Chapter 8 of the FEIR/EIS 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> <p>For more information regarding alternatives to the proposed project please see Master Response 4.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Benefit:</p> <p>a) Eliminates risk of saltwater infiltration during island flooding emergencies which are always rare and short-lived by definition.</p> <p>b) Comparatively low cost.</p> <p>c) Minimal environmental impact and only temporary at that, when deployed.</p> <p>d) No "peripheral canal" or "conveyance" delta bypass canal required...which is an expensive, highly unpopular solution that is tantamount to extending the current concrete California Aqueduct to the upstream headwaters of the Delta below Sacramento. Such a bypass canal would create a tremendous negative environmental controversy and would have highly divisive political consequences.</p> <p>e) Would allow maximum allowable acre-feet of pumping at the California Aqueduct intake-fully as much as any peripheral canal or other Delta bypass would allow, taking environmental factors into account. Even if many "islands" flooded, this supply of fresh water could continue noninterrupted.</p> <p>Install the "backflow prevention gates" at/around Pittsburg, where the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers converge into one outflow. This is also where the fresh water begins to transition to salt water.</p> <p>What about the specter of rising sea levels?</p> <p>This long-term speculation is completely independent from the saltwater intrusion risk discussed above. If sea levels do rise significantly (say, 10'-15'), the entire low-lying Bay Area and Central Valley will be flooded. Trillions of dollars of real estate and industry will be underwater. Fortunately, this change would likely occur slowly over decades, allowing plenty of time for a radical response. Example: San Francisco and the central valley could be protected by the creation of a permanent dam at the Golden Gate area (yes!) with shipping locks. The coastal mountains would do the rest of the job.</p>	
419	3	[ATT1: Map showing location for backflow prevention gates near Pittsburg.]	This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
419	4	[ATT2: Recommended "backflow prevention" gates deisgn.]	This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
420	1	<p>I am writing this email not in the hope that somebody will read it and that it will change opinions but in the hopes that there is some tally of comments on this new messaging of the proposed Delta tunnels.</p> <p>I understand that water is an important commodity in CA and that in order for our state to exist and support the population we've brought to it that we have to severely alter nature and move water around. Despite all of our manipulating we still have a water problem.</p> <p>My fault with this is that we are doing the same thing that we did in the 20s and 30s to solve this problem and we are still faced with it. We need a new solution, which is a bigger bucket or more buckets. If the state water project is simply a way to catch water from nature and</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. 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). 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). 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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>then move it to other parts of the state it can be reasonably equated to somebody collecting rain water on their property and then using hoses to move it to other areas.</p> <p>CA gives us all the water we need, it just doesn't do it at a constant demand because nature doesn't work that way. Instead of building more pipes and hoses to move water from one area to another we need to have bigger buckets or more of them. New reservoirs, similar to the Kern County water bank, are our future. Having open reservoirs kills the efficiency of our system (and yes, I know it costs more).</p>	<p>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. See Master Response 37 regarding water storage.</p>
420	2	<p>The old grandfathered laws (such as the water rights laws in 1919) have to be eliminated. Laws that give people blank checks to use water make them use it inefficiently and hurt all Californians.</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The action alternatives would only divert water 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, as described in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/S. The issue of changes to the State of California water right procedures is beyond the scope of the proposed project which is defined in Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need, of the EIR/S.</p>
420	3	<p>These tunnels will NOT solve the water problem in CA but because the problem is continuous demand of an item that is supplied in fluctuating quantities. The tunnels do not address this and will be another unsuccessful government project that will cost billions of dollars to construct and millions to maintain.</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>
421	1	<p>Fish for People -- Preserving the health of the Delta ecosystem and California aquatic species for the benefit of all Californians should be the highest priority of the state and federal governments. Once expensive new waterworks for increased southward water transport degrade that ecosystem further, it will be gone forever, for everyone. "People vs. Fish" is the deceptive spin of the agricultural industry; in reality it is "Special Interests vs. Fish."</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
421	2	<p>University of California Davis economic studies (see <a href="https://watershed.ucdavis.edu/droughtimpacts">https://watershed.ucdavis.edu/droughtimpacts</a>) are showing that California agriculture is more resilient than expected, declining in value slowly even if the current drought lasts years more. In any case, it would be better to let California agriculture cope long-term with less water than to continue to prop it up by further harming our state's surface water and ground water resources.</p>	<p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via proposed conveyance facilities.</p>
421	3	<p>Westside San Joaquin Valley farmer-plutocrats have been sucking at the government teat at taxpayer expense for years, water-wise. That should have been stopped long ago. Let's do it now. Legislators should give careful consideration to the July 2015 ECONorthwest report, <a href="http://www.econw.com/our-work/publications/estimated-costs-to-retire-drainage-impaired-lands-in-the-san-luis-unit">http://www.econw.com/our-work/publications/estimated-costs-to-retire-drainage-impaired-lands-in-the-san-luis-unit</a>. That report proposes retiring salty land in the San Joaquin Valley as a cost-effective way to cut agricultural water demand. It recommends appropriate compensation to landowners, who must give up their water rights and not be allowed to sell their unused water to others.</p>	<p>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.</p>
421	4	<p>BDCP bait and switch -- I am dismayed at the splitting of BDCP into two halves -- environment (EcoRestore) and water supply (WaterFix) -- for separate and unequal action. Weren't those supposed to be indissolubly linked co-equal priorities? Under EcoRestore, Delta wetlands restoration goals are lowered from 100,000 acres to 30,000. Presumably this</p>	<p>As indicated in this comment, the California WaterFix (Alternative 4A) is now the preferred CEQA and NEPA alternative and does not include implementation of an HCP/NCCP as previously presented for Alternative 4. Alternative 4A would enable DWR to construct and operate new conveyance facilities that improve conditions for endangered and threatened aquatic species in the Delta while at the same time improving</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>will reduce the restoration area in Suisun Marsh -- a personal disappointment for me as a Suisun City resident. Meanwhile the expensive tunnel juggernaut ploughs ahead. One has to think that special interests have managed to hijack the BDCP process. Elaborate efforts appeared to be made to achieve an even-handed process; now I feel deceived.</p>	<p>water supply reliability, consistent with California law (see, e.g., Cal.Wat. Code, § 85001[c]). Implementing the conveyance facilities would help resolve many of the concerns with the current south Delta conveyance system, and would help reduce threats to endangered and threatened species in the Delta, including entrainment south Delta export facilities. The California EcoRestore is a separate program from California WaterFix and has identified goals in the short-term to restore, enhance and protect up to 30,000 acres of Delta Habitat. Longer term goals could include additional Delta habitat restoration included in this program. Please also note that the BDCP and other HCP alternatives are included in this Final EIR/EIS and will be considered during the project decisions-making process.</p> <p>Additional priority restoration projects will be identified through regional and locally-led planning processes facilitated by the Delta Conservancy. Plans will be completed for the Cache Slough, West Delta, Cosumnes, and South Delta. Planning for the Suisun Marsh region is already complete and a process for integrated planning in the Yolo Bypass is underway. The Delta Conservancy will lead the implementation of identified restoration projects, in collaboration with local governments and with a priority on using public lands in the Delta.</p> <p>Providing regulatory oversight to oil companies or large agribusiness is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis.</p> <p>For more information regarding 4A compliance with the 2009 Delta Reform Act please see Appendix 3J of the FEIR/EIS.</p>
425	1	<p>Much as I like Jerry Brown's high speed train, I dislike his proposed twin water tunnels. They are just like the Delta Bypass Canal, only underground. For the same reasons they should be stopped. They would destroy the ecosystem of the Delta.</p> <p>I am not a Delta farmer, but if I were I would not like the water to get any more saline. I am a duck hunter who hunts in the Suisun Marsh. Recently, with the drought, it has been hard to grow much alkali bullrush; instead there is mostly pickleweed. The hungry migrating ducks don't like it or the salty water.</p>	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS.</p>
425	2	<p>I propose moving the tunnel inlets from near Sacramento to near Rio Vista. The tunnel pumps would run only when there is an ebbing tide and fresh water. The tunnel outlets could be in the Clifton Court Forebay. When there are neap tides, a little water could be pumped into Clifton Court as is now. This way the Delta itself would not be disturbed as it has been ever since its fresh water has been sent south. San Pablo Bay would not feel the difference because it has not received much fresh water ever since Shasta Dam was built. I live next to the bay and I remember.</p>	<p>15 alternatives and 3 new subalternatives were analyzed in the EIR/S and the RDEIR/RSEIS respectively. Four major alignments have been included in the EIR/S: Through-Delta, East of the Sacramento River, West of the Sacramento River, and a Tunnel under the Delta. Many additional proposals by public and private individuals and organizations have also been evaluated and described in Chapter 3 of the EIR/S and Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1.</p> <p>Regarding development of alternatives for the EIR/EIS, a description of the process the Lead Agencies followed to develop and screen alternatives is provided in Master Response 4.</p>
426	1	<p>Simply put--any measures that increase water use anywhere in the state are flat-out nuts. (Pun intended.)</p> <p>If I need to write anything more than that, there is something very, very wrong with this world.</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
427	1	<p>As a southern Californian, I am totally against this proposal. To my mind this completely defeats the purpose of conserving water. Why are we going through all of these restrictions if we're just going to have water poured down our throats? Look, you have the citizenry in</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>conservation mode right now. I don't think it would be prudent to now give people the idea that they may not have to be so committed to conserving in the future. We need to get our priorities straight. As Californians, conservation is our future! If we don't accept that, then we're doomed to cycles of feast or famine.</p>	<p>index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. One of the fundamental purposes of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP and CVP system in the Delta to provide water supplies of the SWP and CVP for users located south of the Delta and Delta water quality consistent with statutory and contractual obligations of the SWP and CVP, as described in Section 2.3 of Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need, of the EIR/S. Alternative 4A, the proposed project, will maintain compliance with Delta outflow regulatory requirements for all water years with the use of the North Delta intakes, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supplies, and Chapter 6, Surface Water. A detailed discussion of the specific Delta outflows under a range of seasons and water year types is contained in Appendix 5A.</p> <p>The EIR/S assumes that the projected water demands in the No Action Alternative and all of the EIR/EIS alternatives include the assumptions that water conservation will be implemented by 2060 in accordance with State law, as described Section 30.1.3 of Chapter 30, Growth Inducement and Other Indirect Effects, of the EIR/EIS. However, it is recognized that the proposed project would not provide adequate water supplies to meet the SWP and CVP contract amounts in most circumstances. The BDCP/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. 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, 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). It is assumed that the State and local agencies will invest in future water supplies to replace reduced surface water and groundwater supplies and to meet future growth, as described in Chapter 30, Growth Inducement and Other Indirect Effects.</p>
427	2	<p>Instead of throwing more money down the drain (or tunnel), why don't we use it to help residents retrofit their homes for gray water use, or a rain barrel set-up or increase irrigation efficiency on our farms and in our cities. There are so many other ways that this money could be used to affect change and preparedness in our state for years to come.</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
428	1	<p>The proposal to build two giant tunnels under the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta to ship northern California water south is so blatantly unwise as to be ridiculous! If we wish to protect the environment and save the Delta from disaster, we must not allow this to happen.</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
428	2	<p>Salt water is already encroaching upon the Delta as a consequence of the diminished flow of fresh water through the estuary. The tunnels would be able to carry up to two thirds of the volume of the Sacramento River. If they were to operate up to capacity, it would completely destroy the ecology of the region. The idea that this project would provide an acceptable solution to California's water crisis is outrageously absurd!</p>	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS.</p>
428	3	<p>I'm afraid that this proposal is just another example of how powerful, moneyed interests are corrupting our ability to make sound, intelligent and rational decisions about crucial matters that affect our economy, and the environment upon which we all must depend for our survival. We must ask ourselves who stands to benefit from this project.</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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>We need look no further than the Kern County Water Agency and the Westlands Water District. These agencies represent California's most powerful corporate agribusinesses. These organizations will consume and exploit lion's share of our water in order to continue and expand their operations.</p> <p>The construction of the tunnels is likely to cost more than fifty billion dollars. Who would benefit from the actual construction of this mammoth project?</p>	<p>to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal and State regulating agencies, ESA compliance, and project design. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods. The construction of the water delivery facilities is estimated to cost \$14.9 billion, an amount that would be paid for by the state and federal water contractors who rely on Delta exports. The range of costs for water vary widely among contractors south of the Delta. Costs depend on the source of water, transport facilities, energy requirements, among other factors. For the agricultural customers of the CVP, prices range from \$100 per acre-foot to more than \$400 per acre-foot. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, which buys water from the SWP, estimates that the cost of the proposed project would translate into about \$5.00 extra per household, per month in its service area. The final cost of water from the new conveyance facilities would be determined by numerous factors. A number of these significant factors, such as the project yield and allocation of costs, have yet to be determined. Please see Master Response 5 for information regarding funding of the proposed project.</p>
428	4	<p>The San Joaquin Valley is a desert. Water-intensive agriculture in the desert cannot be sustained without importing increasing amounts of water from other sources. Northern California needs this water. We cannot afford to export it to sustain that which is unsustainable in the long run.</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The SWP and CVP operations under the action alternatives would only deliver water under existing water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board to DWR and Reclamation for use by the SWP and CVP. 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>
428	5	<p>We must come to our senses. Environmentally destructive activities can no longer be tolerated! If we continue to destroy the planet upon which we all depend for survival, we shall all lose in the end, including those whose selfish, greedy interests drive this capitalist economy!</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
429	1	<p>Please assure that the plan acknowledges the public's right to be on the navigable water and on the temporarily dry banks of the water below ordinary high water mark; and the obligation of state agencies to refrain from unnecessarily interfering with the public's use of these public trust lands. In particular, that state agencies should not prevent members of the public from crossing state-owned or state-controlled land to get to the public trust lands.</p>	<p>Implementing the proposed project would permanently affect recreational access at the immediate intake facilities and temporarily at facilities needed for construction, such as barge landing sites. Chapter 15, Recreation of the EIR/EIS provides Mitigation Measure Rec-2, provides for alternative bank fishing site access to reduce this potential effect. Please refer to Master Response 13 regarding the Public Trust Doctrine and Chapter 31, which discusses Public Trust Doctrine considerations related to the California WaterFix.</p>
430	1	<p>In addressing the effect of the project on recreation and access to recreational site, please recognize that the entire length of the navigable water, including banks below high water, are now open to public recreational use. Please do not only address access to parks, wildlife areas, and other formally designated sites.</p>	<p>Because the Delta is so expansive, recreation would be able to occur throughout the Delta during and after construction. The EIR/S focuses on formal recreation sites for Impact REC-1, which analyzes well-established or private recreational facilities. However, the EIR/S does consider informal recreation, such as upland and on-land recreation, and on-water recreation (boating, kiteboarding, etc.), as well as bank fishing. Mitigation Measure REC-2 would be implemented to provide alternative bank fishing sites. To compensate for the loss of these informal sites during construction, the project proponents will enhance nearby formal fishing access sites, including partnering with Yolo County to enhance the Clarksburg Fishing Access site on the west bank</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			of the Sacramento River, with the Sacramento County Department of Regional Parks to enhance the Cliffhouse Fishing Access site on the east bank of the Sacramento River and the Georgiana Slough Fishing Access site east of the Sacramento River, and with Contra Costa County to enhance fishing sites near Clifton Court Forebay, as well as other nearby sites. Prior to construction of the proposed water conveyance facilities, the project proponents will ensure adequate signage will be placed at the informal sites that would be directly affected by construction of the intakes, directing anglers to the formal sites. Upgrading the existing fishing access sites will be completed prior to beginning construction of the intakes.
431	1	I personally believe that the proposed twin tunnels will devastate the environment, the economy and the wildlife of the Sacramento Delta area if they are allowed to be built.	<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 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 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>
431	2	<p>There isn't enough fresh water in this area as it is. And to pump more of it south will only make it worse.</p> <p>Please do not allow this to happen to the Sacramento Delta area.</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Water delivered to the SWP and CVP water contractors participating in proposed project would be within the existing contract amounts to serve agricultural lands that have been cultivated and existing and planned community populations, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply. The proposed project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply.</p> <p>The EIR/S modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.</p>
432	1	I am opposed to the tunnel project. Please reconsider spending our hard-earned money on this endeavor.	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.
432	2	The long-term health of the Delta depends on us to be good stewards of our resources. This project does not do that. We don't need these tunnels and they will destroy our 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>
432	3	There are plenty of other problems or issues that could benefit from our attention and hard-earned money. The tunnel project is not one of them.	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.
433	1	Well, so far you've deceived us by having contractors map land and farms they plan to take by eminent domain, the process hasn't been thoroughly vetted yet and you're doing	As state agencies, the Department of Water Resources and the California Natural Resources Agencies have an obligation to provide the public with educational information that is rooted in fact, based on reasonable

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>this.This shows me why I have little faith in your development plans and being open with me. All you care about is not having open discussions, stealing water, so the Delta will cease to exist in its present form. It is barely existing with you taking all the water you over-allocated. Start over and only allow water to cover what storage we have the ability to contain. Build more storage, then allow it to go south.</p>	<p>assumptions supported by facts and expert opinions substantiated by facts. Doing so for a project of large scale and complexity can be a challenge. The BDCP website, blog, Your Questions Answered, and social media platforms have been the primary vehicle for communicating important project information and correcting misinformation. Brochures, factsheets, webinars and videos are other tools the State has employed to educate the public about the proposed BDCP and the EIR/EIS process. Representatives from the State have also held numerous meetings and briefings around the state to educate stakeholders and provide them with critical information about project developments and the EIR/EIS process. Brochures, factsheets, webinars, reports and other information is kept on the project website, <a href="http://www.BayDeltaConservationPlan.com">www.BayDeltaConservationPlan.com</a> and is available for review. Historical materials remain available for review and are labeled as achieved or superseded. For more information on the public outreach efforts made during the BDCP and EIR/EIS process, please see Chapter 32 of the EIR/EIS and Master Response 40.</p> <p>More information on how DWR has developed the project in an open and transparent manner is provided in Master Response 41.</p> <p>The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats.</p> <p>The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state’s water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow <a href="http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf">http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf</a>. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well.</p> <p>The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: <a href="http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/">http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/</a>.</p> <p>Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 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>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives.</p>
434	1	<p>This should not be named the Bay Delta Conservation Plan. It does the exact opposite. It wrecks the Bay and the Delta.</p> <p>Removing water from the Bay and Delta won't make the Bay and Delta better.</p> <p>Obviously what has happened is that the agribusiness in the south has given money to Governor Brown's campaign fund in order to steal water for them.</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. Please note the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (California WaterFix) and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A.</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 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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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), Master Response 26 (Change in Delta Exports), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
435	1	<p>In the 1980s at the planning stage of South Valley Water Project, I was studying at the University of California graduating from the College of Natural Resources. During my studies I wrote several papers on Southern Valley Water Project, a shift in water suppliers to [the] Los Angeles Basin. I proposed the Central Valley Project could only be [a] short-term solution; as an efficient long-term supply it would depend on alternative watersheds and supplies (Hetch Hetchy and EBMUD [East Bay Municipal Utility District]) to complement and back up the Central Valley Water Project (supply), additional water storage collection for dry years, proposed as only optimal long-term water supply without causing dissertation in supply region overtime. [sic]</p> <p>Approval of the project without proposed conservation measures, thereby ignoring the micro hydrologic cycle of the region [and] implementing an inefficient allocation of current project application, has changed the basis of the optimal solution or sustainable water supply from Central Valley Water Project.</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Water delivered to the SWP and CVP water contractors participating in proposed project would be within the existing contract amounts to serve agricultural lands that have been cultivated and existing and planned community populations, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply. The proposed project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply.</p> <p>The 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). 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). 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>
435	2	<p>The constant [removal] of water from central California overtime evaporation transportation creates "evaporation transformations." Transforming the LA Basin into mountain lakes and a major flood basin and leaving the Central Valley in a permanent drought scenario, southern California unprepared for this change in hydrology, all addition rainwater was lost to ocean run off. [sic]</p> <p>Southern California has built up water reserves and will continue to receive large amounts of rain during the winter due to evaporation transformation. The current measures implemented by [the] region of central California must be modified before we run out of fresh water. If conditions continue from SWP/BDCP this will have the opposite effect as expected under the Endangered Species Act; instead, permanent loss of freshwater will wipe out the endangered species we are protecting.</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. 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. Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase flows in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries in drier periods.</p> <p>The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow <a href="http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf">http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf</a>. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well. 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: <a href="http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/">http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/</a>.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>The EIR/S modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.</p> <p>Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p>
435	3	I propose [that] "the new tunneling technology used for BDCP be also used to create additional watershed for central California . . ."	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
436	1	<p>I was born and raised in California and I absolutely love our state. I was born in southern California, raised in San Jose, went to college in Fresno and had my first teaching job in South Lake Tahoe. I now live in Vacaville which is a perfect spot for me because it is so central to all the people I love and to all of the natural resources I love: Pt. Reyes, Mendocino, Yosemite, Lake Tahoe, Lassen and most especially the Sacramento Delta. The Sacramento Delta is unique to California: the fishing, the water sports, the quaint little towns, the boating makes this geographical area a landmark for the Solano, Yolo and Sacramento counties. It is a treasure just like Yosemite is a treasure. Would you even think of removing the water from Bridal Veil Falls to southern California? No -- there would be public, nationwide and perhaps even international outrage (given how many tourists visit the area). The same is true [of] the Sacramento Delta. There are many families who do not have the funds or resources to travel to Yosemite, Lake Tahoe or Lassen so they picnic, camp and visit the Sacramento Delta.</p> <p>Have you visited the Delta? There are many farmers who provide produce for our nation here on our Delta. And I am against the rerouting of our local water for central and southern California. As Assemblyman Jim Frazier so aptly put the BDCP's proposal will not create "additional water" it will merely dig a deeper wound to our water supply from here in Solano, Yolo and Sacramento counties to put a bandage on the water needs of central and southern California.</p> <p>When voters voted last year for your proposal there was supposed to be attention and aid given to marshes and the Delta and now that is nowhere in sight.</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.
436	2	The tunnels are expensive and so are desalination plants. But desalination plants will produce additional water--other countries use desalination plants--why can't our country? We have brilliant people living in California I'm sure they can figure out a way to build them and as far as funding them how were the tunnels going to be funded? Use the same madness. Or perhaps a new tax from water parks and swimming pool construction/water usage can be incorporated.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
436	3	<p>We also need to continue to educate people and corporations that water is a precious resource and we need to respect its value and conserve it just like we conserve electricity and gasoline, and not just in times of drought but at all times -- because droughts, just like earthquakes, are a part of California.</p> <p>Please don't create havoc with the beauty of our local landmark, The Sacramento Delta. Let's cherish it like we cherish Yosemite, Lassen Volcanic National Park, Pt. Reyes, Golden Gate Park, Muir Woods for the people who live and visit the Solano, Yolo and Sacramento counties.</p>	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
438	1	I'm against the tunnel project. The Delta is our ecological wildlife sanctuary that also contains farms, fisheries and recreational businesses.	<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>
439	1	You are killing California. We've burned up now you're going to dry us up more and kill our habitats. Next the poorer people will have to draw straws to even get water in lieu of the rich. Stop this now.	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p>
440	1	<p>Please please please...Hear the People of California and not the Governor, special interest money-greedy groups and the almond growers who are going to ship out the almonds to other countries anyway.</p> <p>I was born in Stockton and like all who were raised there, work there or moved away know all about the Delta and what it stands for and what is its duty for the wildlife, people and economy.</p> <p>The tunnels will ruin what the Delta is there for. Once the bad deed of building a tunnel is done, the California Government won't be able to go backwards and fix it to its original form. They will have death on their hands, killing thousands and thousands of all wildlife and people who depend on the Delta for their livelihood. We refuse to be his guinea pigs or a pet project to leave his name/legacy at our expense and suffering. And if it backfires? Think about this one thing: drought and water problems have always been with us. If before and in the 40's, 50's, 60's, 70's, 80's, 90's and so on, this tunnel idea came about...it would of be shredded and off the table. Maybe it has and it was weighed and stopped as the right people saw the effect it would have on the environment. This is one man's desire with bad money behind him and it is dirty, smells dirty, and will end up dirty. Jerry Brown is known for his bulldoze get it done no matter what policy. Blinders are on him on this tunnel issue and he will not listen to the people.....What happened to By the People, For the People? (Not By Jerry, For Jerry!) And the recent secret meeting in Sacramento where there was no public forum, only propaganda at tables and question and their answer? We the people want a vote! It is our right to vote on this tunnel issue.</p> <p>Northern California is part of a land mass that respects their state more than Southern California. We are a state known for our mountains, oceans, redwoods, wildlife, our beauty! This plan will put into motion [actions] that will ruin everything that California stands for. We will have nothing except tunnels that suck our water system dry, kill all nature, and strip us all from our heritage that our forefathers gave to us. My great-great-grandfather was one of the Founding Fathers of Stockton. He never intended to ever put the Delta in harm's way. Jerry Brown is putting the Delta in harm's way, not a good man, caring man. We are losing everything to growth, greed and to egos in the capital of California. Southern California is</p>	<p>Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>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>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>sucking Northern California dry. Agricultural communities are going to be hurt by this project and I am sure it will cost them financially dearly and some farms won't survive, including their families. Tunnels will cost the tax-payer dearly and we are all over-taxed as it is. So many things and projects throughout California have been cut and for what? All the money going to the bullet train and the tunnels? Criminal and dirty.</p> <p>Look around...when was the last time you saw peaceful wildlife and clean rivers and clean beaches? The tunnels will affect the natural life of the land and eco balance flowing normally...each season to season, the way it has for hundreds and hundreds of years. The tunnels and bullet train will cause nature to go against the grain. Maybe only in the Monterey Region where the laws are stiff and they protect our environment much better than Jerry Brown does. Maybe he should move there for a while and take some lessons from that government operation.</p> <p>No tunnel, no bullet train, no changes that are only for the worse....not for the better!</p>	
442	1	<p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Delta Tunnels plan.</p> <p>The Delta Reform Act of 2009, in which the California State Legislature committed to the "coequal goals" of providing a more reliable water supply for California AND protecting and restoring the cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of the Delta, cannot be upheld if the Delta Tunnels come to pass.</p> <p>The California WaterFix does not meet the restoration goals of the Delta Reform Act; it is simply a plan to export more water out of the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary. The Delta Tunnels will also fail to provide more reliable water because the Delta watershed is already oversubscribed by five times in normal water years.</p> <p>The California WaterFix does not address the environmental, public health or economic impacts of the proposed Delta tunnels project. Also, the plan ignores alternatives that would save California tax and ratepayers billions of dollars, while investing in the jobs and local water sources that build sustainability.</p>	<p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <p>For more information regarding the proposed project's compliance with the Delta Reform Act please see Master Response 31 and Final EIR/EIS Appendices 3I and 3J.</p>
442	2	<p>My environmental concern with the plan [is]:</p> <p>The impact on wildlife and plant species in the Delta that depend on freshwater include the Delta smelt, Chinook salmon, steelhead, San Joaquin kit fox, and tricolored blackbird, protected species already on the brink that will face decimation due to a diminishing food-web.</p>	<p>Chapter 11 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect fish. Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect plant and wildlife species. Both chapters describe the impacts, both negative and positive, and discuss measures that would be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts and to compensate for significant impacts.</p>
442	3	<p>My environmental concern with the plan [is]:</p> <p>At sea, even the ESA-listed South Pacific Puget Sound Orca Whales depend on migrating Delta species that will be harmed by less water flowing through the Delta.</p>	<p>The project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, Final EIR/EIS. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities, including operations to protect water quality, can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see <a href="http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml">http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml</a>) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			permits (see <a href="http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html">http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html</a> ). The species that are considered in the EIR/S include the Southern resident killer whale ( <i>Orcinus orca</i> ).
442	4	<p>My environmental concern with the plan [is]:</p> <p>The tunnels plan seems to ignore Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act which prohibits federal agency actions that are likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered species or that "result in the destruction or adverse modification of [critical] habitat of [listed] species."</p>	<p>The Proposed Project has been developed with the goals of minimizing and avoiding incidental take of listed species to the maximum extent practicable. Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 12, Terrestrial Biological Resources, Final EIR/EIS, describe effects of the Proposed Project and several alternatives on fish and wildlife species in the Plan Area.</p> <p>Section 7 requires that federal agencies, in consultation with the federal fish and wildlife agencies, ensure that their actions are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of species or result in modification or destruction of critical habitat.</p> <p>Where the alternative does not include preparation of an HCP, ESA compliance for construction and operation of water intakes in the north Delta and associated conveyance facilities would be achieved solely through Section 7. For these alternatives, USFWS and NMFS would not issue a permit and would not act as a lead agency for NEPA compliance. Where Section 7 is the ESA compliance strategy, USFWS and NMFS will assume roles as cooperating agencies for purposes of the NEPA review.</p> <p>Reclamation would be the lead federal action agency for Section 7 compliance where a non-HCP alternative is selected. Reclamation's Section 7 compliance would be expected to also address the Section 7 compliance needs for the USACE permit actions. In cooperation with DWR, Reclamation would prepare a biological assessment (BA) for submission to USFWS and NMFS requesting formal consultation under ESA Section 7.</p> <p>A biological opinion is not required prior to the release of the Draft EIR/EIS. If the alternative selected includes an HCP, the USFWS and NMFS will conduct an internal ESA section 7 consultation prior to issuance of an Section 10(a)(1)(B) permit for the Proposed Action. These federal agencies will coordinate the ESA consultation process and other environmental review processes, such as the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), consistent with federal regulations. In addition, the USFWS and NMFS will consult with the United States Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) to complete biological opinions or a joint biological opinion prior to federal action to carry out the proposed project (e.g., BDCP).</p> <p>For more information on the proposed project's compliance with the ESA refer to Master Response 29.</p>
442	5	<p>My public health concern with the plan [is]:</p> <p>The tunnels will cause increased contamination of municipal water and wells for the millions of rural and urban residents living in the five Delta counties.</p>	<p>The potential for proposed project alternatives to affect water quality constituents of concern for municipal water supply uses in the project area is assessed in detail in Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the EIR/S. Where significant impacts to uses would occur due to the alternative, mitigation to lessen those impacts is provided. Refer also to Master Response 14, Water Quality.</p>
442	6	<p>My public health concern with the plan [is]:</p> <p>The tunnels plan fails to model for potential increases of carcinogens and other formation of byproducts that would cause cancer and other serious health effects.</p>	<p>A health risk assessment (HRA) was developed in support of Chapter 22, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, of the Final EIR/EIS. This HRA evaluates the human health risks resulting from construction emissions produced by the proposed water conveyance alternatives. HRA evaluates the human health risks resulting from exposure to construction emission produced by each BDCP alternative. Construction activities generate toxic air contaminants (TACs) that include exhaust emissions from diesel and gasoline fuel combustion. In addition to TAC emissions, this analysis also evaluates PM2.5 concentrations resulting from PM2.5 emitted by exhaust from both diesel and gasoline engine combustion and from fugitive dust generation. Additionally, in Chapter 22, where the impact analysis determines that there would be a significant impact related to changes in air quality such that sensitive receptors would potentially experience excess cancer risk as a result of constructing the water conveyance facilities, Mitigation Measure AQ-16 would be implemented. As part of this mitigation, To avoid exposing sensitive receptors to substantial DPM concentrations, DWR will provide individuals residing in areas where construction activities associated with the project would create DPM concentrations in excess of air district cancer risk thresholds the opportunity to relocate either temporarily during the construction period or permanently, at the discretion of the affected individuals.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Otherwise, there would be no need for residents in proximity to the water conveyance facilities to evacuate their homes due to increase cancer risk.</p> <p>Potential health concerns related to EMF exposure in general are discussed in Section 25.1.1.5 of the project EIR/EIS. It is indicated the potential health risk from EMF exposure is unknown because over the past 20 years some scientific studies have shown associations between cancers and EMF exposure while others have been less conclusive. Some studies have shown an association between EMF exposure and increased risks of leukemia, brain cancer, and amyotrophic lateral sclerosis; however, the National Research Council and the National Institute of Health have concluded that there is no strong evidence showing that EMF exposures pose a health risk.</p>
442	7	<p>My public health concern with the plan [is]:</p> <p>Environmental justice communities, who depend on subsistence fishing, will also face food and health insecurities as a result of increased contaminants, specifically mercury contamination, in fish and wildlife populations.</p>	<p>Additional detail related to microcystis (due to longer residence times of water) and mercury and selenium related to subsistence fishing was added to Chapter 28, Environmental Justice, in the Final EIR/EIS. As described under each alternative in Chapter 28 for Impact PH-3, the associated increase in human consumption of mercury caused by the action alternatives would depend upon the selection of the fishing location (and associated local fish body burdens), and the relative proportion of different Delta fish consumed. Different fish species would suffer bioaccumulation at different rates associated with the specific species, therefore the specific spectrum of fish consumed by a population would determine the effect of increased mercury body burdens in individual fish species. These confounding factors make demonstration of precise impacts on human populations infeasible. However, because minority populations are known to practice subsistence fishing and consume fish exceeding US EPA reference doses, any increase in the fish body burden of mercury may contribute to an existing adverse effect. Because subsistence fishing is specifically associated with minority populations in the Delta compared to the population at large this effect would be disproportionate on those populations. This effect would be adverse. Please also refer to Master Response 14 regarding Microcystis.</p>
442	8	<p>My economic concern with the plan [is]:</p> <p>For large metropolitan cities such as Los Angeles and San Jose that depend on export water, water rates and/or property taxes will go up, but they will get no additional water.</p>	<p>In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the Final 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 Final 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. However, 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, including in Southern California and San Francisco Bay Area, during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods. As shown in Appendix 5A, Section C, SWP and CVP water deliveries in Southern California and San Francisco Bay Area region would be similar or increased as compared to Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative.</p> <p>The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, which buys water from the SWP, estimates that the cost of the proposed project would translate into about \$5.00 extra per household, per month in its service area. The final cost of water from the new conveyance facilities would be determined by numerous factors. A number of these significant factors, such as the project yield and allocation of costs, have yet to be determined. Please see Master Response 5 for information regarding cost and funding of the proposed project.</p>
442	9	<p>My economic concern with the plan [is]:</p>	<p>An assessment of water quality effects resulting from changing Delta water quality and outflows on San Francisco Bay water quality is provided in Impact WQ-34 in Chapter 8, Water Quality, for all alternatives. The</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		No analysis has been done on how the lack of fresh water flows will impact San Francisco Bay tourism and recreation. These industries depend on Delta fresh water flows for their crab and salmon fisheries, wildlife sighting, boating, and their restaurant economy. This industry is worth billions annually.	water quality assessment considered potential changes in constituent levels for all constituents of concern assessed in detail in Impacts WQ-1 through WQ-30, including changes in salinity, mercury, nutrients, and selenium. The assessment concluded that Alternative 4A would have a less than significant impact to San Francisco Bay water quality.
442	10	My economic concern with the plan [is]:  Salinity intrusion is already impacting the western Delta farms and removing Sacramento River freshwater from the system will make matters worse. Delta farmers cannot irrigate crops with salt water and they certainly cannot plant crops in contaminated soils. The Delta [agricultural] economy, which consists of generations of family farms and farm workers, generates \$5.2 billion for the California economy annually.	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. The potential for water conveyance operations to affect salinity conditions in the Delta (including Suisun Marsh) under existing conditions and future no action conditions, and with implementation of each project alternative (including conservation measures), is assessed in detail in Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the Final EIR/EIS for the salinity-related parameters chloride (Impact WQ-7) and electrical conductivity (Impact WQ-11). Where significant impacts to water quality would occur due to the alternative, mitigation to lessen those impacts is provided. Refer also to Master Response 14 (Water Quality).
442	11	My economic concern with the plan [is]:  California coastal fishing communities depend on thriving wildlife. This historic industry is worth billions annually, with the salmon industry worth \$1.5 billion annually alone. Thousands of jobs and livelihoods are tied to these industries.	For information about effects of the preferred alternative, Alternative 4A, on fish, please see Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Resources, which indicates that effects would not be adverse. Therefore, there would be no adverse effects to the coastal fishing industry due to the alternative.
442	12	My economic concern with the plan [is]:  The operation and construction of the tunnels will obstruct and disable navigable waterways for boating, marinas and other types of leisure activities, in addition to creating conditions of low water flow that will foster invasive aquatic species, such as water hyacinth. Poor water quality also creates unsafe recreation. Recreation and tourism in the Delta generate \$750 million annually.	Impacts TRANS-13, TRANS-17, and TRANS-19 discuss potential effects on navigation caused by the proposed project.  Because it does not involve a physical change in the environment, effects to navigation caused by changes in surface water elevation, by themselves, are not considered environmental impacts under CEQA. Any secondary physical environmental impacts that may result are covered under other impacts. Nonetheless, as explained above, changes in surface water elevation during the construction and operation of the intakes will not have a significant impact on navigation.
442	13	Far less expensive and less environmentally destructive alternatives to the Delta Tunnels were largely ignored. The plan does not seriously consider any alternatives other than new, upstream conveyance. The decision-making process (from the outset) has tilted in favor of increasing water exports from the Delta.	Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. The 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, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please refer to Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.
442	14	Our tax and ratepayer dollars would be much better spent on:  More aggressive water efficiency program statewide that would apply to both urban and agricultural users.	Appendix 1C of the Final EIR/EIS, Demand Management Measures, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. Refer to Master Response 6 for more information on demand management. Although components such as demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the State, they are beyond the scope of the project Please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.
442	15	Our tax and ratepayer dollars would be much better spent on:  Funding water recycling and groundwater recharging projects statewide that would be billions of dollars less expensive for rate payers than constructing a new version of the Peripheral Canal or major new surface storage dams. Meanwhile, these projects move	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 Final EIR/EIS,

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		communities towards water sustainability.	describes the potential for additional water storage.  Please see Master Response 4 regarding the development of alternatives. Please see Master Response 5 for information on Demand Management.
442	16	Our tax and ratepayer dollars would be much better spent on:  Retiring thousands of acres of impaired and pollution generating farmlands in the southern San Joaquin Valley and using those lands for more sustainable and profitable uses, such as solar energy generation.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need of the project.
442	17	Our tax and ratepayer dollars would be much better spent on:  Improving Delta levees in order to address potential earthquake, flooding, and future sea level rise concerns at a cost between \$2 [and] \$4 billion and is orders of magnitude less expensive than major conveyance projects that are currently being contemplated.	Please see Chapter 2, FEIR/EIS, for the BDCP/CWF purpose and need, and Appendix 6A Sections 6A.2 and 6A.3 for discussion on existing levee improvement programs and funding mechanisms, which would not be affected by the BDCP/CWF.  For more information regarding floods and levees please see Appendix 6A.  For more information on levee stability and seismic risk please see Master Response 16.
442	18	Our tax and ratepayer dollars would be much better spent on:  Increasing freshwater flows through the Delta to reduce pollutants so ecosystems and wildlife can be restored.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.  One of the fundamental purposes of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP and CVP system in the Delta to provide water supplies of the SWP and CVP for users located south of the Delta and Delta water quality consistent with statutory and contractual obligations of the SWP and CVP, as described in Section 2.3 of Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need, of the EIR/S. The proposed project, Alternative 4A, will maintain compliance with Delta outflow regulatory requirements for all water years with the use of the North Delta intakes, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supplies, and Chapter 6 Surface Water. A detailed discussion of the specific Delta outflows under a range of seasons and water year types is contained in Appendix 5A. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.
442	19	Our tax and ratepayer dollars would be much better spent on:  Installing fish screens at the south Delta pumps to reduce the current salvage of marine life.	15 alternatives and 3 additional subalternatives were analyzed in the EIR/S and the RDEIR/RSEIS respectively. Four major alignments have been included in the EIR/S: Through-Delta, East of the Sacramento River, West of the Sacramento River, and a Tunnel under the Delta. Many additional proposals by public and private individuals and organizations have also been evaluated and described in Chapter 3 of the BDCP EIR/S and Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1.  Regarding development of alternatives for the EIR/EIS, a description of the process the Lead Agencies followed to develop and screen alternatives is provided in Master Response 4.  DWR and Reclamation are required to improve fish collection efficiency at the existing south Delta salvage facilities, as part of facility improvements required by the National Marine Fisheries Service 2009 biological opinion on the SWP/CVP. For example, in 2014 Reclamation replaced the secondary louver system with a traveling screen system. These screens provide protection by guiding fish into the holding tanks while catching debris on pegs and transporting debris to a collection system at the work surface.  The technology required at the proposed north Delta intakes and the existing south Delta export facilities differ fundamentally. The north Delta intakes would be located on the side of the river channel and so would be designed to comply with CDFW, NMFS, and USFWS fish screening criteria (BDCP Appendix 5B Section 3.B.3.3). The south Delta export facilities are located on dead-end channels and requires active collection and salvage of fishes.  Screening the intakes at Clifton Court Forebay was analyzed during the water conveyance alternative

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			development process and is described in the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS, Appendix 3A. This alternative was eliminated from further evaluation because initial results of recent studies, including information included in the recent NMFS biological opinions, supported a phased approach that would emphasize improvements to operations of fish handling facilities and reduced predator potential within Clifton Court Forebay prior to further analysis of installation of fish screens. Nevertheless, DWR and Reclamation will continue investigating strategies to increase fish salvage efficiency, reduce pre-screen losses, and improve screening efficiencies, consistent with the 2009 biological opinion of the SWP/CVP.
442	20	<p>The Delta has problems that need to be addressed, but the CA WaterFix tunnels are a 20th century idea that won't fix them. It won't produce more water, more reliable supplies, or improved conditions for the environment in the Delta.</p> <p>The new EIR/EIS has not adequately addressed my above stated concerns. That is why I oppose the Delta Tunnels/California WaterFix (Alternative 4A).</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the 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>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.</p>
443	1	Please accept this email to inform you of my extreme opposition to the Delta tunnels plan. As an engineer and voter, I can assure you that this plan makes little logical, economic or political sense [and] will not fix the water shortage problems or assure continued water supply in the event of a large earthquake.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
443	2	This project will cause irreparable harm to farmers and business in the most fertile part of the state, and will only exacerbate the environmental problems caused by farming in the Westlands and south part of the state.	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.
443	3	The structures, as planned, will be more susceptible to damage from earthquakes and terrorist attacks than the existing pliable levee system, and with no ability to immediately stop the flow of water, a failure of the tunnel structures will cause immense flooding to several heavily populated areas.	This comment is on the resilience of the conveyance facilities in the case of an unknown terrorist attack. This potential issue is related to security of the system and not the proposed implementation of the project. Monitoring and on-going facility maintenance is built into the facility operations. Also, see Chapter 9 in the FEIR/EIS for discussion on potential seismic-related impacts to water conveyance facilities, Appendix 3E for seismic and climate change risks to SWP/CVP water supplies, and Appendix 5B for potential responses to reduced south of Delta water supplies.
443	4	<p>This plan is an example of the worst that government has to offer! Moving forward with this project will only endanger numerous lives, destroy several local economies, [and] invite numerous lawsuits based on environmental, economic and safety issues.</p> <p>Please do not let this plan go forward!</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.
444	1	The problem is the Governor is taking all the freshwater and sending it to LA, leaving more salt water throughout the Delta. He calls for an emergency to block up false river which has been flowing like that for 75 years. So what was the emergency, so he could bypass the environmental studies. How convenient only the government can do that. The Governor needs to run a pipe from the Antioch Bridge down the railroad tracks through Brentwood through Byron into Clifton Court tract. Yes, it would cost a lot of money but it wouldn't destroy the Delta. The State Water Resources Board is located right here in Sacramento and they're allowing the Governor to ruin the Delta because of all the salt water he continues to	<p>Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		pull up in here from taking too much fresh water.	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.
444	2	With the new dam installed in False River fisherman cut as more current than ever before and where it ends back up at False River it creates a huge eddy when it hits false river and the water stays turned up and dirty all the time. I wonder what it's doing to the channel in false river there's probably going to be a 60 foot hole when the Governor finally pulls down the dam in False River. Also, the dam built by The Department of Water Resources built in Grant line that they take out once a year because if they didn't they would drain Grant line in the summer months when the pump kicked on at Clifton Court. [sic]	This comment is related to the DWR Temporary Barriers Project and does not address facilities that would be implemented under the California Water Fix or Bay Delta Conservation Plan action alternatives, No Action Alternative, or Existing Conditions.
444	3	The government spends billions of dollars so it won't be a problem to put this pipeline from the San Joaquin River down to Clifton court and let LA share our salt water problem. The salt level at Orwood tract was almost too high to irrigate crops because of the salt level in the water. But the governor already knows this and he doesn't want to share in the salt water problem he just wants to continue to take all the freshwater 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/EIS.
444	4	Northern California is the only one in a drought; go to southern California and see if [they are] conserving water. The politicians don't care about the Delta; they only care about the water. Go take a ride in the Delta and look at how the Water Resources Board is controlling the Delta, it allows people to [litter] and pollute the Delta waters with all boats, barges and construction stuff that is sinking in boat berths and around marinas. I fish the Delta 2 to 3 times a week I see all this firsthand I would be happy to take a party of politicians around and show them the litter and the pollution in the Delta.	Commenter is identifying adverse effects of humans not protecting the Delta through littering and other polluting activities. Commenter also indicates that the Water Resources Board should provide enforcement of littering laws and other polluters (boats and construction). It should be recognized that certain activities are under the purview of the Board (e.g., construction activities); however, other activities (e.g., littering and operating boats on the water ways) are not under the Board's purview. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The comment includes a description of litter and pollution seen in the Delta waters.
444	5	Supervisor Mary Nejedly, stand up to the governor and don't let him ruin our home.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
446	1	I'm calling because I wanted to find out some information on the Bay Delta Conservation Plan -- in particular the tunnels, construction of the tunnels. I understand it's still under EIR, but just wanted to get a rough estimate on where you see the EIR completed, what date that will be. And also if an engineering design team has been selected yet for design of the tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
447	1	Lack of large scale mitigation summation across the Sacramento/San Joaquin River watershed by State Agencies. The Delta is the low spot of a complex watershed that stretches across the State. It is directly affected by upstream changes and modifications. These modifications take time and eventually, either directly or indirectly, affect the Delta. From Redding, to Sacramento, to the Delta, government and quasi government bodies have modified this watershed and received mitigation approval to do so from DWR & Fish and Game. Their requests to perform a detrimental act to the environment was classified as a "take" and provided approval was given based on a mitigation that was largely only evaluated locally only. Sacramento, for example, mitigated the Swainson's Hawks tree loss by purchasing existing trees in another distant county. These mitigations were approved on a local basis, but without an overall view of the Sacramento/San Joaquin watershed. Yet, it is exactly the State's obligation to its citizens to act on the whole system, not just locally. An encompassing view is exactly what the State should be involved in, but it has not tracked, nor can it explain the overall changes to the watershed that is so important to the State. It is my contention that the upstream "takings" and subsequent mitigations have never been added together to determine, in fact, the overall watershed is experiencing negative effects. Some of these mitigations may take years to realize success or failure, and the Delta may not know for years beyond that. The upstream watershed has been extensively	<p>Take in various locations and projects is addressed in the cumulative analysis for fish and terrestrial resources. The new preferred alternative, 4A, would not involve a 50-year HCP/NCCP approved under ESA Section 11 10 and the NCCPA, but rather would achieve incidental take authorization under ESA Section 7 and 12 California Endangered Species Act (CESA) Section 2081(b) assuming a shorter project implementation period. Section 5 of the RDEIR/SDEIS includes a revised and legally sufficient cumulative analysis. Please also see Master Response 9 regarding the cumulative impact analysis.</p> <p>The commenter states that the Delta's watershed has been extensively modified in recent years, and that the EIR/S assumes the current state of the Delta as "normal." The EIR/S and RDEIR/SDEIS do not claim the Delta's current state to be "normal." While the Delta has changed in recent years, it has not been in its original, untouched state since the 1800s. Chapter 2, Purpose and Need, describes how most of the original tidal wetlands and many miles of sloughs in the Delta were removed by channelization and levee construction between the 1850s and 1930s. These physical changes, coupled with higher water exports and declines in water quality from urban and agricultural discharges and changes in constituent dilution capacity from managed inflows and diversions, have stressed the natural system and led to a decline in ecological productivity. The Executive Summary of the RDEIR/SDEIS states the Delta is in a state of crisis. Several threatened and endangered fish species, including Delta smelt and winter-run Chinook salmon, have recently experienced the lowest population numbers in their recorded history. Meanwhile, Delta levees and</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>modified in recent years mostly in the Sacramento area, either directly or indirectly - expansion of cities, removal of habitat etc. The impact of these significant large scale modifications have not yet been felt in the Delta. In other words, the tunnel project assumes the current state of the Delta is "normal", and it's not. In fact, the upstream watershed has been and is being modified, with the approval of the same government agency - DWR. Significant modifications within the delta without fully understanding the impacts of the local modifications within the rivers, is akin to troubleshooting a problem while changing multiple variables at once. The lack of assessing the takings and modifications of the watershed as a whole could possibly lead to a compounding of problems within the Delta and put wildlife at risk very rapidly as all the changes come together.</p>	<p>the infrastructure they protect are at risk from earthquake damage, continuing land subsidence, and rising sea level. A major seismic event causing levee failure could cause an interruption of water exports for as long as several months or even years. And the amounts of water available for human use south of the Delta have already decreased significantly in recent years, independent of the drought, due to regulatory actions by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). Applying federal and state endangered species laws, these entities have required the Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the United States Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) to substantially alter the manner in which they jointly operate the State Water Project (SWP) and the federal Central Valley Project (CVP).</p> <p>The EIR/S compares the impacts from the proposed project to Existing Conditions for the CEQA baseline, and to the No Action Alternative (early long term or late long term) for the NEPA baseline. Please refer to Master Response 1 regarding baselines, and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need.</p>
447	2	<p>The Delta Breeze - We all know the affected predictions of global warming to the State of California. We understand now that small environmental changes over time can be compounded and produce disastrous weather results. The Delta is the heart of one of our most important weather systems and proper consideration has not been provided. What has not been considered is the affect the Delta has on the Delta breeze. In a nutshell, the Delta is the swamp cooler of the Central Valley. Without the Delta breeze weather system, the Central Valley would be a far different place - unbearable likely. Each year the Delta breeze breaks the summer hot streaks. The Sacramento Valley currently relies on the Delta breeze to provide a reprieve from extreme heat that would otherwise have the valley at weeks upon weeks of above 100 degree temperatures. The Delta breeze blows in from the ocean across the Delta where it picks up moisture, cools, and provides important wave action, as it blows into the valley where its cooling is desperately needed for crops, people, animals, and the mountains. The Delta breeze is a fundamental weather system for a majority of Northern California, and the cooling waters of the Delta are an important part of the system. Significant changes to the Delta, its temperature, and its available pool of fresh water, may alter the positive benefits of the Delta breeze that the Central Valley currently relies upon. Without a strong Delta breeze the Central Valley would be unbearable and the inhabitants and farmers of the valley would have to use more water, not less. It would be ironic that a water project would alter the weather resulting in more water use, not less. The current EIR does address negative effects on the Delta breeze.</p>	<p>Change in airflow resulting from the construction and operation of the proposed project is not reasonably foreseeable and would be highly speculative. Analysis of these effects are not required under CEQA Guidelines Section 15145.</p>
448	1	<p>As a California water user and water conservationist, fishing sportsman, and a voter; I strongly oppose the Delta tunnels. These tunnels will cause irreversible loss to our food, wildlife, and clean water. And these tunnels go against Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.</p> <p>Our Delta needs to be preserved and restored. These tunnels will be the death of the Delta and erode our fresh waters.</p> <p>These tunnels are a water killer for the Delta; not a "WaterFix".</p> <p>I firmly request a no vote for the Delta tunnels.</p>	<p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria 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> <p>Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA), federal agencies whose actions may impact listed species are required to consult with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and/or the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), as appropriate, prior to taking any such action to ensure the action is not likely to jeopardize species listed under the ESA or result in destruction or adverse modification of critical</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			habitat. At the end of consultation, USFWS and/or NMFS will complete a biological opinion, setting forth an opinion detailing how the agency action affects the species or its critical habitat.
450	1	Exporting more water from the Sacramento River is not good policy for California.  Restoration of the Delta and our fisheries requires a greater freshwater flow from the Sacramento River through the Delta rather than one diminished by the diversion of more water from the Sacramento River to the Westlands Water District and southern California. An increased flow will disperse pollutants and benefit ecosystems and endangered fish and wildlife.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The action alternatives would only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and 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.  The EIR/S modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.
450	2	The WaterFix plan fails to acknowledge the significant environmental and economic damage it would cause by disrupting productive agricultural land that also benefits fish and wildlife, and instead turning these productive areas into a construction site for years, forever destroying many small-scale Delta farms. Delta wildlife on the brink of extinction will be pushed over and this project will cause a significant loss of diversity, so the monocrops of water-needy rice and almonds can be supplied their disproportionate amount of water. This is in defiance of Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act which prohibits "the destruction or adverse modification of [critical] habitat of [listed] species."	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 propose any changes to existing agricultural practices. 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.
450	3	As California committed to do in the Delta Reform Act of 2009, we urgently need to restore and protect our great Delta and fisheries, and that will require the cessation of water giveaways to the Westlands Water District and southern California users and those northern California towns that do not measure water use. The twin tunnels plan is no solution to reducing water use in a time of drought and of climate change. Rather, it represents another huge, and hugely costly, engineering of our water system to serve special interests. This project demonstrates megalomania on the part of state officials, most significantly Governor Brown who should know better, and the Westside industrial agriculture moguls who are now increasing their almond orchards that require year-round water rather than growing the seasonal crops that make them smaller profits but also use significantly less water.  Instead we need serious support for and requirement of water conservation and efficiency and water reuse. The state taxpayers can support such an effort at a fraction of the financial and environmental cost of the giant tunnels or new surface storage dams that harm both people and fish and lose water to evaporation.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The action alternatives would only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and 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. The project water delivery system would be operated in a manner to protect water users and environmental habitat located upstream of and in the Delta in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see <a href="http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml">http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml</a> ) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see <a href="http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html">http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html</a> ).  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).
450	4	The state needs to require the cessation of farming West Valley lands that should never have been put to agricultural use. These lands can instead provide solar energy that will benefit the state rather than wasting our limited water supplies and further polluting our soil and water. Because the revised EIR/EIS does not address these very basic concerns, we	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. 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		need the DWR to create a new Draft EIR/EIS that provides real alternatives including increased freshwater flow through the Delta and reduced water exports and that does not so heedlessly, pointlessly waste huge amounts of taxpayer and ratepayer dollars on so destructive and inappropriate a plan.	industry. The proposed project does not propose any changes to existing agricultural practices. 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.
451	1	I write to express my very strong opposition to the newest iteration of the very ill-conceived California state water plan, called California WaterFix now that it no longer pretends to seriously address environmental concerns such as restoration of the Delta and our salmon runs.	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).
451	2	Having redirected environmental mitigation to the limited subsidiary entity EcoRestore, that covers fewer than 2000 acres, it clearly fails to meet the 2009 Delta Reform Act "co-equal" goals of Delta restoration and water supply reliability.	The proposed California WaterFix would restore and protect ecosystem health, water supply of the SWP/CVP and water quality within a stable regulatory framework as indicated in Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need by restoring a more natural Delta flow pattern and improving water supply reliability. The California Eco Restore program would be implemented separately from the California WaterFix and is expected to accelerate restoration and protection of up to 30,000 acres in the Delta over the short-term.
451	3	Since we are expecting less, not more, water due to climate change brought on by extravagant burning of fossil fuels, we need to make what we have go further rather than expending a huge amount of money on a very dubious taking of water from the Sacramento River for San Joaquin agribusiness operations.	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. However, 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.
451	4	Conservation and water cleaning and reuse must be instituted immediately. Instead what this plan does is spend billions of mostly public dollars to ensure that California industrial agriculture will get the flow of water these corporations want. Already agriculture uses 80% of California's water. Thus large-scale agriculture should be the first target of a rigorous conservation plan, including restriction of water-needy crops. It is an outrage to see the new almond orchards that are being planted during the current drought. They bring great profit to their owners, thanks to the low cost of the inordinate amount of water they require year-round.	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.
451	5	Originally the Bay Delta Conservation Plan was to be a balancing of Delta restoration and agricultural needs, with attention to restoring the levees and assisting farmers with drip irrigation etc., to bring our water system back into balance between human uses and restoring our once great fisheries. But the political force of billionaire Stuart Resnick and corporate industrial agriculture have succeeded in distorting these intentions beyond	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>recognition.</p> <p>It is hard to imagine a more destructive, environmentally-intrusive plan for addressing California's need for water planning and conservation than the crude conception of constructing and burying two giant 40-mile-long concrete tunnels to take Sacramento water before it reaches the Delta.</p>	<p>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>
451	6	<p>A vastly cheaper and more effective alternative is that studied in the July 2015 report from ECONorthwest (<a href="http://www.econw.com/media/ap_files/San_Luis_Unit_Land_Retirement_Final_Report_071415.pdf">http://www.econw.com/media/ap_files/San_Luis_Unit_Land_Retirement_Final_Report_071415.pdf</a>). If 343,000 acres of Central Valley land (298,000 in Westlands Water District) were taken out of production, ending irrigation would both save 454,000 acre feet of water each year, nearly the requirements of Los Angeles, but it would also put a stop to the poisoning of land and water from the toxic runoff caused by irrigating these high salt- and toxic-chemical-laden lands.</p>	<p>Master Response 4 provides an overview of the steps used in screening and finalizing the alternatives included in the Final EIR/EIS. The alternatives development process applied to developing the BDCP and CWF alternatives carried forward to the EIR/EIS is explained in the Appendix 3A Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives/Conservation Measure 1. Retiring lands would not meet the requirements of the initial alternatives screening step.</p>
451	7	<p>It is the most fundamental requirement of good government to perform a rigorous cost-benefit analysis of any large-scale public works project. The voters of California rejected the last effort to provide northern California water to Westside industrial farms. We do not want our state government to undertake this huge, monstrously environmentally destructive project to serve the narrow profit-making interests of Westside Water District industrial agriculture.</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. Refer to Master Response 3(Purpose and Need) and Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p> <p>The proposed project is costly, but proponents have assessed the benefits as described in the BDCP funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those facilities. Expenditures of public money from other sources would be limited to restoration activities beyond those needed to mitigate the impacts of facility construction. BDCP Chapter 8, which deals with cost issues, and cost-benefit analysis information are available on the BDCP website. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on project costs and funding.</p> <p>The proposed project is a joint RDEIR/SDEIS prepared in compliance with the requirements of CEQA and NEPA which do not include a cost-benefit analysis. An updated cost-benefit analysis will be prepared outside of the CEQA/NEPA process. Before the selection and approval of an alternative considered, the Lead Agencies must comply with the necessary state and federal environmental review requirements. The Final EIR/EIS is intended to provide sufficient CEQA and NEPA support for approval of the proposed project or any of the action alternatives for either compliance strategy. As implementation of the proposed project or any of the action alternatives will require permits and approvals from public agencies other than the Lead Agencies, the CEQA and NEPA documents are prepared to support the various public agency permit approvals and other discretionary decisions. These other public agencies are referred to as responsible agencies and 20 trustee agencies under CEQA (State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15381 and 15386) and cooperating agencies under NEPA (e.g., USACE and EPA).For more information please see 1.1.5 of Section 1 Introduction of the RDERI/SDEIS.</p>
452	1	<p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Delta Tunnels plan. I am convinced 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 fisherman, and wildlife, not just South of Delta agribusiness (translation, water contractors) who are</p>	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please 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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>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. Jerry Brown, this goes against everything you say you believe in. I know it's your father's legacy, but it's time to let it go.</p>	storage.
453	1	I actually have a question about model runs for Appendix B. The CD has two CALSIM runs for Appendix B. Are there any DSM2 runs for Appendix B available? DSM2 was mentioned in Appendix B in the footnotes on pages 70-71 and a few other pages. If DSM2 runs have been done for Appendix B, could we get those model data? I understand some of the model runs for the RDEIR were completed by a consultant (CH2M Hill?). If DSM2 runs were done by the consultant, is it ok that we contact the consultant directly to see if they have the DSM2 data?	The CALSIM II and DSM2 modeling results were provided to the commenter.
455	1	There are alternatives that are a whole lot less costly and are way more protective of the environment. I don't even have to repeat them to you, you know them very well.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria 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>
456	1	<p>I unequivocally oppose the Delta Tunnels Project. The idea that this will fix mistakes made in the 70s and the 00s is crazy and stupid and short-sighted. Is not the definition of crazy "doing the same thing over expecting different results?" Right, argument may be made that this time it's different but only in details. The concept is outdated. Everything is connected, this will have consequences for beyond what's needed. This will become another big dig, over 20-year Boston, MA project, like replacing a radiator in a 25-year-old car. All the parts have worn and sagged together.</p> <p>Look into desalination; I hear San Diego has a plant. Recycle more great water.</p> <p>Financially irresponsible</p> <p>Humanely irresponsible</p> <p>Ecologically irresponsible</p>	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.
457	1	Three Valleys Municipal Water District (TVMWD) relies on State Water Project (SWP) supplies as an important component of Southern California's overall water portfolio. The SWP is uniquely capable of capturing significant quantities of wet-year and wet period samples, allowing the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California to store these	This comment is consistent with information presented in Chapter 1, Introduction, and Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need, in the EIR/S. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		supplies for drought-cycle needs. Were it not for SWP supplies Metropolitan had stored prior to this historic drought cycle, the Southland would be in the throes of a devastating water shortage and severe economic hardship. The ability of the SWP to reliably capture set-period water is at severe risk due to the existing configuration of the pumping system, regulatory constraints and long-term threats due to climate change and catastrophic natural events such as earthquakes and flooding.	
457	2	The modified preferred alternative outlined in BDCP/WaterFix represents a significant shift in this nine-year planning process that TVMWD [Three Valleys Municipal Water District] must review and consider carefully. BDCP began as an effort that sought to combine water system and ecosystem improvements within a single permitting construct as a habitat conservation plan under Section 10 of the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) and as a Natural Communities Conservation Plan under the State ESA law. The modified preferred alternative (Alternative 4a) delineates a different approach, with the WaterFix intake/conveyance improvements proceeding as a stand-alone project with ESA permitting acquired similar to the approach under the existing ESA permitting/regulatory construct of the SWP. Approximately 30,000 acres of proposed Delta ecosystem improvements, meanwhile, would proceed on a parallel, but separate program now as California EcoRestore. TVMWD understands that the rationale of this modification is to identify an achievable path to permitting given overwhelming scientific uncertainty on how to best manage the Delta in the coming decades. The ability of public water agencies to participate in a historic reinvestment of the SWP will rely on a final plan that meets the state co-equal goals of a reliable water supply and restoration of the Delta.	The issues raised by the commenters address the merits of the project. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
457	3	We [Three Valleys Municipal Water District] remain supportive of the overall proposed configuration of the water supply improvements. New intakes in the northern Delta on the Sacramento River would provide the opportunity to divert high- quality supplies and address reverse-flow conditions in the southern Delta that are a result of the existing diversion system. The proposed twin-tunnel conveyance system would protect this supply long- term from threats such as seismic events and sea level rise. Proposed project modifications, such as the consolidation of intake pumping into a single facility in the southern Delta on SWP property near Clifton Court Forebay, have further reduced the physical footprint in sensitivity to Delta communities and existing land use activities. And we continue to support efforts to improve real-time monitoring and embrace adaptive management as essential ways to refine project operation over time to protect both threatened natural fisheries and water supply reliability.	One of the fundamental purposes of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP and CVP system in the Delta to provide water supplies of the SWP and CVP for users located south of the Delta and Delta water quality consistent with statutory and contractual obligations of the SWP and CVP, as described in Section 2.3 of Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need, of the EIR/S. Alternative 4A, the proposed project, will maintain compliance with Delta outflow regulatory requirements for all water years with the use of the North Delta intakes, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supplies, and Chapter 6, Surface Water. A detailed discussion of the specific Delta outflows under a range of seasons and water year types is contained in Appendix 5A.
457	4	Water Supply Reliability: A successful final plan would accomplish several reliability needs: It would re-establish a consistent ability to capture wet-period supplies in a range of year types. It would improve reliability of deliveries in an average year and it would protect supplies long-term. The draft EIR/EIS provides some information that is useful for analysis. Yet, more and better information would be helpful to compare potential water supply capabilities under various future scenarios since billions of dollars have been invested to develop a storage and distribution system designed to capture SWP supplies when they are available and limit demands on the SWP system during dry periods.	This comment is consistent with the fundamental purpose of the project to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta, water supplies of the SWP and CVP for users located south of the Delta, and Delta water quality consistent with statutory and contractual obligations of the SWP and CVP, as described in Section 2.3 of Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need, of the EIR/EIS. Water deliveries to SWP and CVP water users are presented for long-term and drier periods in Appendix 5A, BDCP EIR/EIS Modeling Technical Appendix, of the Final EIR/EIS, Section C, of the EIR/EIS.
457	5	Project Mitigation: The preferred alternative significantly increases habitat mitigation related to construction compare to the very same project as proposed in the draft EIR/EIS in December 2013. Little rationale is provided for the increased mitigation requirements. While full mitigation for project impacts is always appropriate, placing an excessive burden on mitigation for any project, particularly the size of California WaterFix, is not. A careful	The new preferred alternative, 4A, actually decreases the amount of restoration proposed as compared to the previous preferred alternative, 4. 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>review of all the target mitigation acreages is appropriate in order to settle on a final mitigation strategy that is commensurate with impacts. Shifting away from a habitat conservation plan is not a reason to conflate mitigation requirements for the project and unduly impact the final project's cost.</p>	<p>alternatives. The primary parallel habitat restoration program is called California EcoRestore (EcoRestore), which will be overseen by the California Resources Agency and implemented under the California Water Action Plan. Under EcoRestore, the state will pursue restoration of more than 30,000 acres of fish and wildlife habitat by 2020. These habitat restoration actions will be implemented faster and more reliably by separating them from the water conveyance facility implementation.</p> <p>The proposed project, Alternative 4A which is the new preferred alternative, is estimated to cost significantly less relative to the former preferred alternative, Alternative 4. The difference in cost is largely due to the reduced level of restoration specifically funded by the project, as well as other Conservation Measures that are not included under Alternative 4A. As such, the total estimated cost for Alternative 4A is \$14.9 billion in undiscounted 2014 dollars. The estimated cost to implement the former preferred alternative is \$24.7 billion in undiscounted 2012 dollars. For additional information on the cost of the proposed project, please see Master Response 5.</p>
457	6	<p>Improved Water Quality: The preferred alternative continues to advance the objective of improving water quality of SWP supplies. High source quality for this imported supply is essential for Southland communities to increase the production of recycled water. In addition, the new modeling and analysis of in-Delta water quality, as a result of proposed water project operations, is helpful information to assure that the state can meet overall water quality objectives in the estuary.</p>	<p>The issues raised by the commenters address the merits of the project and do not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS documentation.</p>
457	7	<p>Flexible Pumping Operations in a Dynamic Fishery Environment: The preferred alternative continues to advance the objective of avoiding conflicts with migrating fish species. It is particularly important to embrace an adaptive managements approach to project operations to resolve fall outflow requirements for delta smelt, spring outflow requirements for longfin smelt, and operating constraints for south Delta diversions. Significant improvements in water reliability may be achievable without adversely affecting habitat conditions for important fish species. Management of this system must be as dynamic as the estuary itself.</p>	<p>As described in Chapter 4, Sections 4.1.2.2 and 4.1.2.4 of the RDEIR/SEIS, for example, the importance of operational flexibility is recognized in the preferred alternative.</p>
457	8	<p>Delta Ecosystem Restoration: Under the preferred alternative, this responsibility shifts from BDCP to California EcoRestore. This is proposed to be a program separate from California WaterFix. Officially, California EcoRestore is not part of this public comment process. However, this recirculation does provide an opportunity to share input. State agencies need to better clarify their leadership roles in projects identified in California EcoRestore. Whether the state intends to be a lead agency on any given project, for example, remains to be seen. The acreage targets and timetables set forth in California EcoRestore cannot be achieved without lead agencies, expeditious planning and securing the necessary financing. While California EcoRestore is a promising and potential construct for habitat restoration, basic operational details remain unclarified. A more robust program is essential in order to demonstrate that water system investments will be matched with commensurate ecosystem improvements.</p>	<p>Although Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A include only those habitat restoration measures needed to provide mitigation for specific regulatory compliance purposes, habitat restoration is still recognized as a critical component of the state's long-term plans for the Delta. Such larger endeavors, however, will likely be implemented over time under actions separate and apart from these alternatives. The primary parallel habitat restoration program is called California EcoRestore (EcoRestore), which will be overseen by the California Resources Agency and implemented under the California Water Action Plan. Under EcoRestore, the state will pursue restoration of more than 30,000 acres of fish and wildlife habitat by 2020. These habitat restoration actions will be implemented faster and more reliably by separating them from the water conveyance facility implementation.</p> <p>Proposition 1 funds and other state and public dollars will be directed exclusively for public benefits unassociated with any regulatory compliance responsibilities.</p> <p>Additional priority restoration projects will be identified through regional and locally-led planning processes facilitated by the Delta Conservancy. Plans will be completed for the Cache Slough, West Delta, Cosumnes, and South Delta. Planning for the Suisun Marsh region is already complete and a process for integrated planning in the Yolo Bypass is underway. The Delta Conservancy will lead the implementation of identified restoration projects, in collaboration with local governments and with a priority on using public lands in the Delta.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
457	9	Seismic and Climate Change Risks: The modified preferred alternative continues to provide the necessary design and system redundancy to reduce both seismic and climate change risks. Research into seismic risk is continuing. As an example, the potential of levee collapse due to the compaction of peat soils is a new and relatively poorly understood failure mechanism. Previous studies had largely centered on soil liquefaction. The likelihood of levee failure due to a natural disaster appears to be increasing, rather than decreasing, with improved scientific information and understanding. Reducing these risks is paramount to water supply reliability. The conveyance improvements must be sized sufficiently to capture water when it is available. Initial proposals for a larger conveyance system were not pursued due to feedback from wildlife agencies. The final project must be sufficiently sized to adequately address these risks.	<p>Please see Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives Conservation Measure 1, FEIR/EIS, for more information on the water conveyance facility screening process. As described in Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need, FEIR/EIS, project purposes include improving water conveyance through the Delta and increasing water supply reliability in a manner that minimizes or avoids adverse impacts to listed species, and allows for protection and enhancement of aquatic natural communities. The project proponents believe the current design and operational components of Alternative 4A will best meet these purposes.</p> <p>For more information on levee stability and seismic risk please see Master Response 16.</p>
457	10	Governance and Adaptive Management: As a habitat conservation plan, BDCP had been proposing a detailed governance structure in order to implement various conservation measures. The modified preferred alternative no longer proposes to advance a habitat conservation plan. However, an adaptive management process to guide future water project operations is essential to the long-term success of California WaterFix. The same hold true for advancing tidal and floodplain habitat restoration projects as mandated in the existing biological opinions for pelagic and anadromous fish species. The need for an effective governance/adaptive management structure in partnership with the public water agencies is as necessary under California WaterFix/California EcoRestore as it was under the previous BDCP construct. Such a structure must be fully detailed and agreed upon before decisions can be made by public water agencies to invest in a final project proposal.	Adaptive management to deal with changes due to climate change will be important to the success of the objectives. A detailed response describing the proposed adaptive management program is presented in Master Response 32.
458	1	On a personal level, the Delta is where I have grown up and have chosen to raise my family. The Delta is where I learned the value of living things and environmental ethics. As a state that prides itself on its amazing natural features, I believe that building tunnels and diverted water away from the Delta is unethical and goes against the ethics of the beautiful state we live in.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p>
459	1	<p>My husband and I are totally against the Governor's proposed twin tunnels for the following reasons:</p> <p>More salt water will push into the Delta.</p> <p>The proposed cost is money the State doesn't need to spend always goes over budget in the end.</p> <p>Will destroy farms, wildlife, and habitat that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>Object to privately owned land that would be taken over.</p> <p>All and all, it's a bad deal.</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> <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>
460	1	Governor Brown has been pushing this Delta tunnel project, which is nothing more than an underground peripheral canal that when presented to the voters of California was soundly rejected. I understand there will be no vote put to the people of California to build or not build these tunnels. Most people I talk to about the tunnels have never heard of it, nor do they know the effect this project will have on the largest estuary in the western United	<p>The commenter raises issues related to voter approval and public outreach and education. Please refer to Master Response 36 for information on how the proposed project differs from the peripheral canal.</p> <p>As state agencies, the Department of Water Resources and the California Natural Resources Agencies have an obligation to provide the public with educational information that is rooted in fact, based on reasonable</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		States.	assumptions supported by facts and expert opinions substantiated by facts. Doing so for a project of large scale and complexity can be a challenge. The BDCP website, blog, Your Questions Answered, and social media platforms have been the primary vehicle for communicating important project information and correcting misinformation. Brochures, factsheets, webinars and videos are other tools the State has employed to educate the public about the proposed BDCP and the EIR/EIS process. Representatives from the State have also held numerous meetings and briefings around the state to educate stakeholders and provide them with critical information about project developments and the EIR/EIS process. Brochures, factsheets, webinars, reports and other information is kept on the project website, <a href="http://www.BayDeltaConservationPlan.com">www.BayDeltaConservationPlan.com</a> and is available for review. Historical materials remain available for review and are labeled as achieved or superseded. For more information on the public outreach efforts made during the BDCP and EIR/EIS process, please see Chapter 32 of the EIR/EIS and Master Response 40.
460	2	<p>I am not a biologist, but I cannot be convinced that diverting the Sacramento River before it enters the Delta will not have a huge negative effect on the Delta, which is an estuary that needs fresh water flowing through it to sustain the ecosystem of the Delta.</p> <p>How can the Delta survive this diversion of fresh water that has flowed through it long before any of us were here?</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
460	3	The water in California belongs to all Californians, not a group of wealthy, well-connected corporate farmers. I was outraged when I read [Stewart] Resnick took over the state's water bank in what amounted to a backroom deal. Now he and the corporate agribusiness' interests in the Central and San Joaquin Valleys want to take the Sacramento River for their own interests, not for the interests of California or 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 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. 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.
460	4	The oil companies also want this project to be built so they can get the huge amount of water needed to frack oil out of the ground.	<p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows. Fracking - or "hydraulic fracturing" -- presumably could be an "industrial" use of water, and is a lawful use of water. Pursuant to Senate Bill 4 from 2013 (Stats. 2013, Ch.313), moreover, the state Department of Conservation, through its Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR), is currently working on fracking regulations. Please see Master Response 34 for additional information regarding use of water delivered by proposed water conveyance facilities.</p> <p>One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board.</p> <p>The proposed project Lead Agencies have no power to impose penalties on individual water users. DWR and Reclamation have contracts with various entities, some of which sell water to water retailers, who have individual policies and programs to motivate ratepayers to conserve water. Different districts have the right to take different approaches depending on their individual circumstances.</p>
460	5	Who will pay for this project? The estimated cost to build these tunnels as stated by	Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on costs and benefits. The project would cost

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		independent analysts is fifty billion dollars. What return will the people of California get in building these outrageously expensive tunnels?	approximately \$15 billion to build (not \$50 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.
460	6	I strongly urge the state and federal officials promoting the Delta tunnel plan to consider other proposals to distribute the water of California more fairly and equitably.	Please refer to Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives. Also, please Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management and Master Response 34 for additional details on the determination of beneficial use.
461	1	<p>The RDEIR/SDEIS does not evaluate the potential impacts related to changes to Alternative 4 and two additional sub-alternatives, nor any substantive changes to the EIR. The objectives following are directed to the entire EIR. You have failed to disclose state plans to take Delta farms. We are Delta farmers in Clarksburg.</p> <p>Exhibit A [ATT1]</p> <p>An e-mail dated August 17, 2015 from "Restore the Delta" that refers to newly released documents at:</p> <p><a href="http://restoredelta.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/DCE-Cm1-Property-Acquisition-Plan-1-Fr-MWD-PRA-2015.pdf">http://restoredelta.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/DCE-Cm1-Property-Acquisition-Plan-1-Fr-MWD-PRA-2015.pdf</a></p> <p>and</p> <p><a href="http://restoredelta.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/DCE-Cm1-Property-Acquisition-Plan-2-Fr-MWD-PRA-2015.pdf">http://restoredelta.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/DCE-Cm1-Property-Acquisition-Plan-2-Fr-MWD-PRA-2015.pdf</a></p> <p>The two documents above referenced via the "Restore the Delta" e-mail attached, are incorporated herein, as if fully set forth, by this reference.</p> <p>In truth, we believe you plan to take our prospective business advantage, life earnings, children's inheritance, and entitlement rights without inverse condemnation proceedings and without compensation. We are not on the list of farms for compensation, but there will be a taking if this plan is approved and we cannot build our dock across the river from one of your stations. We began the organic certification and dock plans years ago, knowing and believing the tunnel project was politically driven and brainless. In our opinion, no reasonable person would approve of the project without personal economic or political gain. This project is motivated by greed.</p>	<p>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; the lead agencies have proposed measures that would support and protect agricultural production in the Delta by securing agricultural easements and/or by seeking opportunities to protect and enhance agriculture with a focus on maintaining economic activity on agricultural lands. Please see Master Response 18 for more information on agricultural mitigation and Master Response 24 for information on the Delta As a Place.</p> <p>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 2013 Draft 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 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 Statewide Economic Impact Report (<a href="http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/Draft_BDCP_Statewide_Economic_Impact_Report_8-5-13.sflb.ashx">http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/Draft_BDCP_Statewide_Economic_Impact_Report_8-5-13.sflb.ashx</a>).</p> <p>The Lead Agencies are required to compensate landowners if the land is required for the proposed project.</p>
461	2	<p>It is not reasonably possible for one small farmer to list the countless rights violated by this project. We, on behalf of all Delta farmers, claim the human rights inherently known to the people, without exception, in the Bill of Rights.</p> <p>The RDEIR/SDEIS does not appear to consider the Bill of Rights nor the expense of abrogating them through conniving secrecy and recently disclosed litigation anticipated under eminent domain. This does not include our farm nor our business plan. We expect our loss will be between 40 and 100 million dollars if we cannot complete our business plan because of the project. If we are just one claimant in a class that the State has known about, and failed to disclose, then the undisclosed costs should and must be disclosed in the RDEIR/SDEIS.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need of the proposed project, which does not conflict with the Constitution of the United States. The Fifth Amendment provides that the government may only exercise this power if they provide just compensation to the property owners. The proposed project would comply with this amendment. When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the alternative. See response to comment 461-1.</p> <p>The commenter's address listed on the letter is within the City of Sacramento, which is not within the project's footprint. The commenter did not provide an address or name of the farm so it is not possible to describe potential impacts to the property or business.</p> <p>The text, as currently stated in Section 16.1 of Chapter 16, states that the Delta is located within portions of Contra Costa, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Solano, and Yolo counties and includes portions or all of the cities of Sacramento, Isleton, Elk Grove, West Sacramento, Rio Vista, Pittsburg, Antioch, Oakley, Brentwood,</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Stockton, Lathrop, Manteca, Tracy, and Lodi. This chapter describes socioeconomic effects in the Delta region. The study area for the socioeconomic analysis comprises Sacramento, San Joaquin, Yolo, Solano, and Contra Costa Counties, collectively referred to as the Delta region. The discussion of the Delta region describes the existing socioeconomic conditions of the statutory Delta and the surrounding Delta counties.
461	3	<p>Small farmers are not obligated to educate the Governor, the Legislature, nor the Courts. We rely on the inalienable rights delineated by our heritage. We the People own the water, the State and Federal lands and buildings, and all the rights set forth in the Constitution of the United States.</p> <p>The people have been denied due process by the failure to disclose the true plans set forth in Exhibit A. The People have been denied due process by the secrecy maintained by Governor Brown and his administration.</p>	The Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS have been provided to publicly disclose the proposed project and alternatives and describes the potential environmental impacts of the project alternatives. Considerable time has been devoted to public review of these documents. Please refer to Master Responses 39 and 40, related to public review and outreach.
461	4	<p>NOTICE OF INTENT</p> <p>Incorporeal hereditaments are rights that run with the land. The State of California cannot take them without compensation. The media consistently suggests that water rights are complicated. I, as a representative of The People, disagree. I learned of the intended, still undisclosed, government taking on 8/17/2015.</p> <p>It is my legal position that elected officials may not take incorporeal hereditaments without due process and compensation.</p> <p>Any secretive abrogation of individual property rights related to the RDEIR/SDEIS has and will create individual causes of action, more appropriately presented as a class action by all effected riparian rights owners. I have not deferred our rights to any reclamation district, attorney, nor governmental agency. The Class to be defined will consist of all unrepresented riparian rights owners affected by the project.</p>	When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the alternative. See response to comment 461-1.
461	5	[ATT1: Delta tunnels: Documents Reveal State Plans to Take Delta Farms]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
461	6	[ATT 2: The United States Bill of Rights, and later Amendments to the United States Constitution.]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
461	7	[ATT 3: The Constitution of the United States.]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
462	1	<p>SJCOG [San Joaquin Council of Governments], Inc., as administrators of the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan (SJMSCP), a member of the San Joaquin County Delta Coalition and collaboratively working with Friends of the River, Restore the Delta, the California Water Impact Network, the California Sportfishing Protection Alliance, and the Environmental Water Caucus(EWC) (a coalition of over 30 nonprofit environmental and community organizations and California Indian Tribes) are writing to urge you to provide an additional 60-day extension to the comment period on the recently released Bay-Delta Conservation Plan (BDGP)/California "WaterFix" and the partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report and Supplemental Draft</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 39 for more information about the public review period. In order to facilitate a more easy review of the changes in the RDEIS/SDEIS compared to the Draft EIR/EIS, a version of the document was made available that included hyperlinks and track changes, in addition to a Section 508-compliant version.</p> <p>For more information regarding public comment responses please see Master Response 42.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Environmental Impact Statement (RDEIR/SDEIS) to December 29, 2015.</p> <p>We appreciate the recent 60-day extension to October 30, 2015, but as you know, the RDEIR/SDEIS contains substantial changes from the initial public draft. The DEIR/SDEIS amounts to nearly 8,000 pages of additional documentation. Additionally, we have been informed that the responsible agency will not consider any of our previous comments applicable to the new alternatives, despite the many similarities. As a result, we are faced with cross-referencing all of the previous comments to ensure that the responsible agency is fully aware of all the concerns.</p> <p>Given the size and complexity of the documents, particularly in light of the 40,000 pages associated with the original draft EIR/EIS, and the need to cross-reference previously submitted comments, we strongly believe the current public comment period is inadequate. Affording an additional 60 days, beyond the current review period, is clearly warranted and justified.</p> <p>Should you have questions, please contact me at 209-235-0600 or mayo@sjcog.org for further comments. We also request the courtesy of a prompt written response to this request for an additional 60-day extension of the public comment period.</p>	
463	1	<p>I want to go on record as opposing the water diversion tunnels for the CA Delta.</p> <p>We are in a prolonged drought, and removing water from the Delta ecosystem will harm both it and the people who live in it.</p> <p>The Governor's stated goal of insuring a stable water supply for the southern users, in case of catastrophic failure of the levee system, by providing bypass tunnels is admirable, but his solution is wrong.</p>	<p>It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 (Demand Management) for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project. 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 also refer to Master Responses 4 (Alternatives) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
463	2	<p>Reinforcing the levees so they can withstand both earthquakes and rising sea levels is a much more cost effective, long-term solution.</p>	<p>Please refer to Appendix 6A for information on why levee improvements are not part of the proposed project. Also, please refer to Master Response 4 for details on the selection of alternatives and Master Response 3 for details on the project purpose and need.</p>
463	3	<p>70% of the water that flows south from the Delta goes to San Joaquin farmers who grow water-intensive crops for export, so they are exporting our State's water in a time of severe drought, when the Governor has called for water conservation. Having those farmers move to different crops that are not water-intensive, even if the State has to provide short term subsidies to help offset the cost of the changeover, is a much more effective way to save water.</p> <p>If the farmers complain that other crops aren't as profitable, remind them that profit at the expense of others is wrong.</p> <p>Agribusiness is no longer the huge portion of our State's economy it once was, and we need</p>	<p>The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. 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.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>to transition away from water wasting agriculture by a small group of farmers, if it can't be reformed.</p> <p>Tell the Governor to lead us into the future, not insure that we are mired in the past.</p>	
465	1	<p>Friends of the River (FOR), Restore the Delta, the Center for Biological Diversity, the California Water Impact Network, the California Sportfishing Protection Alliance, and the Environmental Water Caucus (EWC) (a coalition of over 30 nonprofit environmental and community organizations and California Indian Tribes) object to the adverse modification of critical habitat for five threatened and endangered fish species, which would occur under the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP)/California Water Fix/Water Tunnels project.[Footnote 1: The lead agencies for the project are the federal Bureau of Reclamation and the California Department of Water Resources. ] Under the BDCP, three large new intakes would divert vast amounts of water from the Sacramento River between Clarksburg and Courtland through two tunnels roughly 35 miles south for export from the Central Valley and State Water Projects' pumping plants. As a result of this massive new diversion ("Water Tunnels project"), enormous quantities of freshwater which now flow through the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta before being diverted would never even reach the Delta.</p>	<p>The determination regarding adverse modification of critical habitat and jeopardy is reserved for NMFS and FWS in their BiOp. The Biological Assessment describes the effects on designated critical habitat, and includes measures to avoid, minimize, or compensate for these effects. A ROD for this EIR/EIS will not be issued until the BiOp is issued. See also Master Response 29 and Chapter 11 of the Final EIR/EIS.</p>
465	2	<p>The BDCP Delta Water Tunnels project is not a permissible project under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) because it would adversely modify critical habitat for at least five endangered and threatened fish species. We previously addressed the failure of the BDCP agencies to develop and consider a range of reasonable alternatives increasing Delta flows by reducing exports in our July 22, 2015 letter to you. This letter expands on the ESA substantive and procedural violations to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) alternatives analysis violations set forth in our earlier letter.</p>	<p>Please refer to the response to comment 465-1. With regard to alternatives, please see Master Response 4.</p>
465	3	<p>First, the Sacramento River Winter-Run Chinook Salmon is listed as an endangered species under the Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. [section] 1531 et seq. Likewise, the Central Valley Spring-Run Chinook Salmon, Central Valley Steelhead, Southern Distinct Population Segment of North American Green Sturgeon, and Delta Smelt, are listed as threatened species under the ESA.[Footnote 2: Each of these species is listed under the California Endangered Species Act as well, with most of them considered threatened. Bay Delta Conservation Plan, Section 1.4.3, Covered Species, Table 1-3, p. 1-24. This table shows that under the California Endangered Species Act, Delta smelt is listed as threatened; however, the BDCP species account for Delta Smelt states that the California Fish and Game Commission elevated delta smelt to the status of endangered on March 4, 2009. (BDCP, Appendix 2A, section 2A.1.2, p. 2A.1-2, lines 21-24.) Longfin smelt is considered threatened, winter-run Chinook salmon is considered endangered, spring-run Chinook salmon threatened, fall- and late fall-run Chinook salmon are considered species of special concern; and green sturgeon (southern DPS) is also considered a species of special concern. Longfin smelt is at this time a candidate species for listing under the federal Endangered Species Act.] Second, the reaches of the Sacramento River, sloughs, and the Delta that would lose significant quantities of freshwater flows through operation of the proposed Water Tunnels are designated critical habitats for each of these five listed endangered and threatened fish species. Third, no Biological Assessment has been prepared and transmitted to the U.S. Fish and Service (USFWS) or National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) by Reclamation with respect to the Water Tunnels project. Fourth, ESA Section 7 consultations have not occurred and no Biological Opinion has been prepared by the USFWS or NMFS with respect to the effects of the operation of the Water Tunnels on the five federally listed species of fish or their designated critical habitats. Fifth, because of Reclamation's failure to prepare</p>	<p>The commenter correctly identifies the status of the listed species. As for the effects on critical habitat and ESA consultation process, please see Response to comment 465-1.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Biological Assessments and failure to initiate ESA consultation, no "reasonable and prudent alternatives" (RPAs) have been developed or suggested by the USFWS or NMFS to avoid species jeopardy or adverse modification of designated critical habitat.</p>	
465	4	<p>Approval of the Water Tunnels project in the form of preferred Alternative 4A or otherwise would violate the substantive prohibitions of Section 7 of the ESA by adversely modifying designated critical habitat as well as by jeopardizing the continued existence of the endangered and threatened fish species.</p> <p>Approval of the Water Tunnels project would violate the procedural requirements of the ESA because Reclamation has not evaluated its proposed action "at the earliest possible time" to determine whether its action may affect listed species or critical habitat and has not entered into formal consultation with USFWS and NMFS.</p> <p>Approval of the Water Tunnels project would violate the procedural requirements of NEPA because the BDCP Draft EIR/EIS and Water Fix RDEIR/SDEIS have not been prepared "concurrently with and integrated with" Biological Assessments and Biological Opinions required by the ESA. Again, the Biological Assessments and Biological Opinions, though required, do not exist.</p> <p>These are not deficiencies that can be "fixed" by responses to comments in a Final EIR/EIS. Instead, Reclamation and the Department of Water Resources (DWR) must prepare a new Draft EIR/EIS to be circulated for public review and comment. The new public Draft EIR/EIS document must include the range of reasonable alternatives including alternatives increasing flows by reducing exports as set forth in our July 22, 2015 letter. The new public Draft NEPA document must also be prepared concurrently with and integrated with the ESA required Biological Assessments, Biological Opinions, and include reasonable and prudent alternatives, developed by the USFWS and NMFS. The required reasonable and prudent alternatives would include alternatives increasing flows through the Delta to San Francisco Bay by reducing exports.</p>	<p>Please refer to the response to comment 465-1 and Master Response 4. Concurrent with the development of the EIR/EIS, DWR and Reclamation developed a biological assessment for purposes of consulting under Section 7 of the ESA. That biological assessment was submitted to NMFS and FWS in August 2016 and was made available at <a href="http://www.californiawaterfix.com">www.californiawaterfix.com</a>. A biological opinion is not required prior to the release of the Draft BDCP/CWF EIR/EIS, but Reclamation will not sign a ROD until the BiOp is received.</p>
465	5	<p>The Water Tunnels Threaten Jeopardy and Adverse Modification of Designated Critical Habitat of Endangered and Threatened Fish Species in Violation of the Substantive Prohibitions of the ESA</p> <p>The Sacramento River Winter-Run Chinook Salmon is listed as an endangered species under the ESA. 50 C.F.R. [section] 17.11. Critical habitat for the species was designated to include the Sacramento River extending from River Mile 0 near the Delta to River Mile 302, which is far north of the proposed BDCP diversion near Clarksburg. 50 C.F.R. [section] 226.204. The Water Tunnels project would divert enormous quantities of freshwater from the Winter-Run Chinook Salmon's designated critical habitat. The four threatened fish species mentioned above would likewise lose enormous quantities of freshwater from their designated critical habitats because of diversion of water resulting from the project. [Footnote 3: The Central Valley Spring-Run Chinook Salmon is listed as a threatened species under the ESA. 50 CFR [section] 17.11. Critical habitat for the species was designated to include the Sacramento River from Lat 38.0612, Long -121.7948, near Mile 0, upstream to Elk Slough (38.4140, -121.5212) in Clarksburg, California. 50 C.F.R. [section] 226.211(k)(5)(i).</p> <p>The Central Valley Steelhead is listed as threatened under the ESA. 50 CFR [section] 17.11. Critical habitat for the species was designated to include the Sacramento River from Lat 38.0653, Long -121.8418, near Mile 0, upstream to Elk Slough in Clarksburg. 50 CFR [section]</p>	<p>Please refer to the response to comment 465-1. These comments pertaining to the status of some of the covered species are accurate descriptions.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>226.211(l)(5).</p> <p>The Southern Distinct Population Segment of North American Green Sturgeon is listed as threatened under the ESA. 50 CFR [section] 17.11. Critical habitat for this species is designated to include the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta including all waterways up to the elevation of mean higher high water within the area defined in California Water Code Section 12220. 50 CFR [section] 226.219(a)(3). The National Marine Fisheries Service's website provides a map displaying Green Sturgeon critical habitat:</p> <p>&lt;<a href="http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/pdfs/criticalhabitat/greensturgeon.pdf">http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/pdfs/criticalhabitat/greensturgeon.pdf</a>&gt;. The map indicates that the critical habitat includes the Sacramento River from Mile 0 near the Delta to upstream beyond the proposed intake site near Clarksburg.</p> <p>The Delta Smelt is listed as threatened under the ESA. 50 CFR [section] 17.11. Critical habitat for the species was designated to include "all contiguous waters of the legal Delta." 50 CFR [section] 17.95-e-Fishes-Part 2. The US Fish and Wildlife Service's website provided a map displaying some of the Delta Smelt's critical habitat:</p> <p>&lt;<a href="http://www.fws.gov/sfbaydelta/maps/delta_smelt_critical_habitat_map.pdf">http://www.fws.gov/sfbaydelta/maps/delta_smelt_critical_habitat_map.pdf</a>&gt;. The map indicates that the Delta Smelt's critical habitat includes the Sacramento River near Mile 0 upstream to the proposed BDCP intake site near Clarksburg.]</p>	
465	6	<p>"The ESA provides 'both substantive and procedural provisions designed to protect endangered species and their habitat.'" San Luis &amp; Delta-Mendota Water Auth. v. Jewell (Jewell), 747 F.3d 581, 596 (9th Cir. 2014), cert. denied, 135 S.Ct. 948 and 950 (2015). Pursuant to the commands of Section 7 of the ESA, each Federal agency "shall . . . insure that any action authorized, funded, or carried out by such agency . . . is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered or threatened species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of [critical] habitat of such species. . . ." 16 U.S.C. [section] 1536(a)(2). "Actions" include "actions directly or indirectly causing modification to the land, water, or air." 50 C.F.R. [section] 402.02 (Emphasis added). "ESA section 7 prohibits a federal agency from taking any action that is 'likely to jeopardize the continued existence' of any listed or threatened species or 'result in the destruction or adverse modification' of those species' critical habitat." San Luis &amp; Delta- Mendota Water Auth. V. Locke (Locke), 776 F.3d 971, 987 (9th Cir. 2015).</p>	Please refer to the response to comment 465-1.
465	7	<p>The BDCP itself identifies stressors and threats to each of the five [fish] species. Common threats and stressors to the five species include habitat loss due to the operation of water conveyance systems, increasing water temperatures and predation hotspots. By installing gigantic diversion intakes in at least three locations between Clarksburg and Courtland, and by diverting massive amounts of water from the Sacramento River, the Water Tunnels project will literally reduce the amount of aquatic habitat available to these five species in their critical habitats. Additionally, the massive diversion will reduce flow in the critical habitat and contribute to a further increase in water temperature. The Effects Analysis chapter (Chapter 5) of the Draft BDCP Plan (November 2013) admits that significant adverse effects could result from the Water Tunnels on the covered fish and their habitat including: "Change in entrainment of fish in water diversions. Change in predation as a result of new structures. Modification of river flow. Change in habitat. Change in food and foraging. Permanent indirect and other indirect losses. Disturbances related to construction and maintenance." (Plan, ch. 5, 2-13).</p>	<p>Please refer to the response to comment 465-1.</p> <p>Additionally, the operational criteria included in the preferred alternative, 4A, is based on several years of coordination with fish agencies and incorporation of the best available science to avoid and minimize the effects of changes in Delta operations. The existing south Delta and proposed NDD would operate in coordination and the maximum diversion capacity at each facility is subject to various constraints included in the preferred alternative, 4A, as well as existing requirements such as D-1641. With mitigation included, none of the impacts to listed fish species is identified as significant or adverse for Alternative 4A in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>For additional details related to other stressors impacts, please refer to Master Response 23.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
465	8	<p>The BDCP identifies key hydrologic and hydrodynamic changes that reduce or adversely modify habitat of the listed fish species. (These changes will exacerbate threats and stressors already known to affect these fish. BDCP modeling in the RDEIR/SDEIS finds that through-Delta survival rates of winter-run, spring-run, and fall-run Chinook salmon all decrease relative to the No Action Alternative from Water Tunnels operation. (RDEIR/SDEIS Tables 11-4A-23, 51, and 74).</p> <p>Specifically, the BDCP identifies reduced habitat due to water storage and water conveyance systems as a stressor and threat to Winter- Run Chinook Salmon. BDCP EIR-EIS Administrative Draft, 11A-47 (March 2013). There will be adverse effects on juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon including near-field (contact with screens and aggregation of predators) and far- field (reduced downstream flows (Plan, ch. 5, 5.3-23; RDEIR/SDEIS p. 4.3.7-48), reduced Sacramento River attraction flows for migrating adult winter-run Chinook salmon (Plan, ch. 5, 5.3-29), possible reduction of survival of juvenile winter-run Chinook salmon during downstream migration and possible negative effect on upstream migration of adult winter-run Chinook salmon by changing attraction flows/olfactory cues. (Plan, ch. 5, 5.3-32). The BDCP also admits that "A potential adverse effect of the BDCP on adult winter-run Chinook salmon will be the reduction in flow downstream of the north Delta diversions on the Sacramento River, reducing river flow below the north Delta intakes." (Plan, ch. 5, 5. 3-45; BDCP Appendix 5C, Tables C.A-41 and C.A-42; RDEIR/SDEIS Figures 4.3.2-7 and 4.3.2-8.) The reduced outflow along with the possible change in olfactory signals due to change in the flow mixture "could affect upstream migration." (Id.). The RDEIR/SDEIS states: "when compared to the CEQA baseline, [Alternative 4A, the Water Tunnels], including climate change, would substantially reduce the quantity and quality of spawning and egg incubation habitat for winter-run Chinook salmon relative to existing conditions." (RDEIR/SDEIS, 4.3.7-58.) The BDCP likewise identifies similar threats and stressors to the Spring-Run Chinook Salmon, Steelhead, Green Sturgeon, and Delta Smelt that would result from the Water Tunnels.[Footnote 4: See references to threats and stressors for the four other fish species in Attachment 1 of this letter.]</p>	<p>Please refer to the response to comment 465-1.</p> <p>Additionally, subsequent to the draft BDCP ( Alternative 4), Alternative 4A has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Analysis of Alternative 4A was included in the REIR/SEIS and it concluded that none of the effects highlighted by the commenter would be significant for the preferred alternative, with environmental commitments applied in some cases, for the reasons described in the analyses.</p>
465	9	<p>In 2013, NMFS reiterated its previous "Red Flag" comment that the Water Tunnels project threatens the "potential extirpation of mainstem Sacramento River Populations of winter-run and spring-run Chinook salmon over the term of the permit . . ." (NMFS Progress Assessment and Remaining Issues Regarding the Administrative Draft BDCP Document, Section 1.17, 12, April 4, 2013). As we pointed out in our July 22, 2015 letter, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has called for alternatives addressing "the need for water availability and greater freshwater flow through the Delta." (EPA Letter, August 26, 2014, p. 2). Likewise, the Army Corps of Engineers, State Water Resources Control Board, and USFWS scientists also raised concerns regarding the BDCP's impacts on water quality and impacts to endangered and threatened species.[Footnote 5: We briefly summarized some of these agencies comments in our July 22, 2015 letter (at pp. 8-10) to you.]</p> <p>However, comments from other federal agencies were ignored. In April 2015, the claimed habitat conservation elements of the BDCP have been dropped or drastically pared back in the switch from the BDCP to the "California Water Fix." As just one example, the plan to provide "65,000 acres of tidal wetland restoration" has been eviscerated to merely "59 acres of tidal wetland restoration." (RDEIR/SDEIS ES-17 (emphasis added)). Consequently, the current Water Tunnels project is even more of a threat to fish species and their habitat compared to the previous version that resulted in the concerns raised then by the EPA, Army Corps of Engineers, State Water Resources Control Board, and NMFS and USFWS</p>	<p>As described in Chapter 4, Section 4.1 of the RDEIR/SEIS, development of the preferred alternative reflects the input of federal agencies. Specifically among the comments received on the DEIR/EIS was the suggestion that DWR should pursue permit terms shorter than 50 years due to the levels of uncertainty regarding both the long-term effectiveness of habitat restoration in recovering fish populations and the future effects of climate change on the Delta and the Sacramento River watershed. Other comments suggested that the proposed conveyance facilities should be untethered from the habitat restoration components of the project, with the latter to be pursued separately; habitat restoration would be undertaken under the California EcoRestore program. Ultimately, the change is a result of the ESA compliance approach, which was changed in April 2015, from an HCP (Section 10) to a Section 7 Biological Assessment.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		scientists.	
465	10	<p>“The goal of the ESA is not just to ensure survival but to ensure that the species recover to the point it can be delisted.” Alaska v. Lubchenko, 723 F.3d 1043, 1054 (9th Cir. 2013), citing Gifford Pinchot Task Force v. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 378 F.3d 1059, 1070 (9th Cir. 2004). Pursuant to the commands of the ESA, each Federal agency “shall. . . insure that any action authorized, funded, or carried out by such agency. . . is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered or threatened species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of [critical] habitat of such species . . .” 16 U.S.C. [section] 1536(a)(2) (emphasis added). “[T]he purpose of establishing ‘critical habitat’ is for the government to carve out territory that is not only necessary to the species’ survival but also essential for the species’ recovery.” Gifford Pinchot, 378 F.3d 1059, 1070. Also, “existing or potential conservation measures outside of the critical habitat cannot properly be a substitute for the maintenance of critical habitat that is required by Section 7 [of the ESA, 16 U.S.C [section] 1536].” Gifford Pinchot, 378 F.3d 1059, 1076.</p> <p>Taking the fresh water flows and safe refuge away from the endangered and threatened fish species would neither insure their survival nor insure their recovery and delisting. On-the-ground habitat restoration is not a lawful substitute under the ESA for maintaining the critical habitat of and in the waters of the Sacramento River, sloughs, and Delta. The reduction of water and flows, increased residence times of water, and increased water temperature are adverse modifications of their critical habitat. Approval of the BDCP would violate the ESA. The Water Tunnels project is thus not permissible under the ESA.[Footnote 6: We have brought the impermissibility of the Water Tunnels project given the substantive prohibitions of the ESA and the related procedural ESA and NEPA violations to the attention of Reclamation and DWR on numerous occasions for more than two years now. These prior communications include the FOR letters of June 4, September 25 and November 18, 2013, January 14, March 6, May 21, and July 29 (including pp. 10-11), 2014, EWC letter of June 11, 2014 (including pp. 29-30) and our recent joint letters of July 16 (requesting an extension of time to comment), and July 22 (alternatives), 2015. We also addressed these issues in our meeting with federal agency representatives in Sacramento on November 7, 2013.]</p>	Please refer to the response to comment 465-1.
465	11	<p>Reclamation is Presently Violating both NEPA and ESA Procedure by Failing to Issue a Draft EIR/EIS Concurrently with and Integrated with ESA Required Biological Assessments and Biological Opinions</p> <p>Extinction is forever. Fortunately, the ESA obligates federal agencies "to afford first priority to the declared national policy of saving endangered species," Tennessee Valley Authority v. Hill, 437 U.S. 153, 185 (1978). Despite that, Reclamation has failed to prepare a Biological Assessment pertaining to its action and has failed to initiate consultation with USFWS and NMFS even though Biological Assessment preparation and initiation of consultation are required by the ESA. (See RDEIR/SDEIS 1-15 (under "Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act")). The RDEIR/SDEIS concedes that "formal consultation under ESA Section 7" will be necessary. (Id.).</p> <p>Section 7 of the ESA (16 U.S.C. § 1536(a)(4) requires that "Should the agency find that its proposed action may affect a listed species or critical habitat, it must formally or informally consult with the Secretary of the Interior, or his or her delegee [USFWS and/or NMFS]." Jewell, 747 F.3d 581, 596 (emphasis in decision). "Formal consultation is required when the acting agency or consulting agency determines that the proposed action is likely to adversely affect a listed species or critical habitat. 50 C.F.R. [sections] 402.13, 402.14.</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response 29 regarding claims that the BDCP Draft EIS/EIR and RDEIR/SDEIS violate the ESA. Reclamation has prepared a biological assessment and is pursuing a BiOp under Section 7 of the ESA and DWR has prepared an application for an incidental take permit under 2081(b) of CESA for the California WaterFix.</p> <p>For more information regarding Section 7 please see Master Response 29.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Formal consultation requires the consulting agency . . . , to issue a biological opinion stating whether the proposed action is likely to jeopardize such species or habitat. 16 U.S.C. [section] 1536(b); 50 C.F.R. § 402.14." Jewell, 747 F.3d at 596 (emphasis in decision).</p> <p>ESA Regulations (50 C.F.R. [section] 402.14(a)) require that "Each Federal agency shall review its actions at the earliest possible time to determine whether any action may affect listed species or critical habitat. If such a determination is made, formal consultation is required. . . ." Karuk Tribe of California v. U.S. Forest Service, 681 F.3d 1006, 1020 (9th Cir. 2012) (en banc)(emphasis added), cert. denied, 133 S.Ct. 1579 (2013). The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals has repeatedly held that: "Any possible effect, whether beneficial, benign, adverse or of an undetermined character, triggers the formal consultation requirement." Western Watersheds Project v. Kraayenbrink, 620 F.3d 1187, 1210 (9th Cir. 2010). Accord, Karuk Tribe, 681 F.3d 1006, 1027; Cal. Ex rel. Lockyer v. U.S. Dep't of Agric., 575 F.3d 999, 1018 (9th Cir. 2009).</p>	
465	12	<p>Even the ardent advocates for the Water Tunnels project who prepared the 48,000 pages of BDCP advocacy documents do not contend that taking large quantities of water away from the Sacramento River, sloughs, and Delta will not have "any possible effect, whether beneficial, benign, adverse or of an undetermined character" on the endangered and threatened fish species or their habitat. Not surprisingly, no preposterous claim of "no possible effect" is made in the Draft EIR/EIS or RDEIR/SDEIS. But instead of reviewing the proposed Water Tunnels at the earliest possible time, Reclamation is delaying ESA review until some unspecified and unacknowledged future time.</p>	<p>Please refer to the response to comment 465-1.</p>
465	13	<p>The NEPA regulations require that "To the fullest extent possible, agencies shall prepare draft environmental impact statements concurrently with and integrated with environmental impact analyses and related surveys and studies required by the . . . Endangered Species Act. . . ." 40 C.F.R. [section] 1502.25(a). "The [ESA] regulations also acknowledge that the agencies are expected to concurrently comply with both Section 7 of the ESA and NEPA. See 50 C.F.R. [section] 402.06 ('Consultation, conference, and biological assessment procedures under section 7 may be consolidated with interagency cooperation procedures required by other statutes, such as the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).')." Jewell, 747 F.3d 581, 648. "ESA compliance is not optional," and "an agency may not take actions that will tip a species from a state of precarious survival into a state of likely extinction." Nat'l Wildlife Fed'n v. Nat'l Marine Fisheries Serv., 524 F.3d 917, 929-30 (9th Cir. 2008). Consequently, against this threat of extinction, conducting the draft EIS public review and comment stage without Biological Assessments or Biological Opinions leaves the public in the dark and violates both the ESA and NEPA. In the absence of the ESA required analyses, the draft EIS/EIR is "so inadequate as to preclude meaningful analysis" in violation of NEPA. 40 C.F.R. [section] 1502.9(a).[Footnote 7: The CEQA rule is the same. Recirculation is required where feasible project alternatives were not included in the Draft EIR. CEQA Guidelines, 14 Cal. Code Regs., [section] 15088.5(a), or when "The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded." CEQA Guidelines, [section] 15088.5(a)(4).]</p>	<p>Please refer to the response to comment 465-1.</p>
465	14	<p>Reclamation has violated the "at the earliest possible time" ESA mandate and the "concurrently with and integrated with" NEPA mandate by prematurely issuing the Draft EIR/EIS and now the REDIR/SDEIS attempting to hide from the reviewing public the critical pertinent information and analyses that would be supplied by the missing Biological Assessments and Biological Opinions. New upstream diversions of large quantities of water from the Sacramento River will undeniably "affect" the listed fish species and their critical</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response 29 regarding claims that the BDCP Draft EIS/EIR and RDEIR/SDEIS violate the ESA. Reclamation has prepared a biological assessment and is pursuing a BiOp under Section 7 of the ESA and DWR has prepared an application for an incidental take permit under 2081(b) of CESA for the California WaterFix.</p> <p>According to CEQA, an EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		habitats.	of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. Due to the substantial modifications to the several of the Draft EIR/EIS alternatives, the Lead Agencies recirculated the EIR/EIS documents for additional public comment. The RDEIR/SDEIS meet the requirements of CEQA in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21092.1 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 and NEPA (40 CFR 1502.9[c][1] and [2]).
465	15	<p>The public now has what it does not need: unsupported advocacy from the consultants speculating that the adverse effects will be offset or that the effects will not really be all that adverse. The public does not have what it does need: the federal agency Biological Assessments and Biological Opinions required by the ESA and NEPA.[Footnote 8: "The ESA requires an agency to use 'the best scientific and commercial data available' when formulating a BiOp." Locke, 776 F.3d 971, 995. "The purpose of the best available science standard is to prevent an agency from basing its action on speculation and surmise." Locke, 776 F.3d at 995.]</p> <p>The evasion of ESA obligations by Reclamation is both extreme and deliberate. Reclamation has on August 26, 2015 joined with DWR in submitting a petition to the State Water Resources Control Board for a change in the point of diversion necessary for the Water Tunnels. The petition recites that "The proposed project reflects the culmination of a multiyear planning process that began in 2006 . . ."(Petition cover letter, p. 1). The passage of nine years makes a mockery of the ESA requirement to commence ESA review "at the earliest possible time." Because of the absence of the ESA-Required Biological Assessments and Biological Opinions, Reclamation feels free to make the demonstrably false representation in the petition that "The California WaterFix would result in substantially improved conditions in the Delta for endangered and threatened species and afford greater water supply reliability for the state." (Petition cover letter, p. 2).</p>	Please refer to the response to comment 465-1. The best available scientific and commercial data available was used in preparation of the BA.
465	16	<p>Red flag comments and the Record [of Decision] so far have made it clear that there is at minimum significant uncertainty about whether the Water Tunnels project is even permissible under the ESA. This critical issue cannot be resolved until the Biological Assessments and Opinions have been prepared. Reclamation has not obtained the determination pursuant to ESA-required consultation whether the "preferred alternative" - the Water Tunnels - is even lawful or feasible.</p> <p>Against this threat of extinction from known stressors and negative effects on the critical habitat, conducting the NEPA environmental draft process prior to and in a vacuum from the ESA consultation process violates the ESA command to carry out the ESA process "at the earliest possible time" and violates the NEPA command to conduct the NEPA and ESA processes "concurrently" and in an "integrated" manner. This also constitutes unlawful piecemealing or segmenting of the NEPA process from the ESA required analyses of the jeopardy and habitat threats posed by the proposed Water Tunnels.</p>	Please refer to response to comment 465-1.
465	17	<p>Reclamation is Proceeding in the Absence of the "Reasonable and Prudent Alternatives" that Must be Developed and Identified pursuant to the ESA</p> <p>Our July 22, 2015 letter to you set forth the NEPA violations resulting from the failure of the BDCP documents including the Draft EIR/EIS and the new RDEIR/SDEIS to include a range of reasonable alternatives increasing freshwater flows through the Delta by reducing exports and not including new upstream conveyance. We pointed out how Reclamation and DWR have ignored repeated warnings and suggestions made to them over the years by public</p>	Please refer to the response to comment 465-1. With regard to alternatives, please see Master Response 4.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>agencies including the EPA, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and State Water Resources Control Board, by the National Academy of Sciences and by the Environmental Water Caucus (EWC).</p> <p>Beyond ignoring the NEPA alternatives mandate, expert government agencies, the Academy and the EWC, Reclamation is also ignoring the crystal clear prohibitions and mandates of the ESA and NEPA. The previous section set forth the procedural ESA requirements for consultation "at the earliest possible time" and the procedural NEPA requirements for the NEPA Draft EIS to be prepared "concurrently with and integrated with" the analyses required by the ESA.</p>	
465	18	<p>Under Section 7 of the ESA, 16 U.S.C. [section] 1536(b)(3)(A), after consultation "If it appears that an action may affect an endangered or threatened species, the consulting agency must provide a biological opinion to the action agency explaining how the action 'affects the species or its critical habitat.' Id. [section] 1536(b)(3)(A). When a biological opinion concludes that the action is likely to jeopardize an endangered or threatened species, or adversely modify its habitat, then the consulting agency must suggest 'reasonable and prudent alternatives [RPA].' Id." Cottonwood Env'tl. Law Ctr. V. U.S. Forest Serv., 789 F.3d 1075, 1085 (9th Cir. 2015). Accord, Jewell, 747 F.3d 581, 596; Locke, 776 F.3d 971, 988. The consulting agency "in the course of proposing an RPA, must insure that the RPA does not jeopardize the species or its habitat." Jewell, 747 F.3d 581, 636.</p> <p>We pointed out in our July 22, 2015 letter (at p. 10) that Reclamation and DWR had to drop the attempt to sell the Water Tunnels as part of a habitat conservation plan. The USFWS and NMFS scientists were unwilling to find falsely that the Water Tunnels would not be harmful to endangered species of fish and their habitat. The RDEIR/SDEIS calls this "difficulties in assessing species status and issuing assurances over a 50 year period . . ." (RDEIR/SDEIS, 1-2). In fact, for more than three years, the federal scientists have been issuing "Red Flag" warnings that the Water Tunnels threaten the "potential extirpation of mainstem Sacramento River populations of winter-run and spring-run Chinook salmon over the term of the permit," contrary to publicity claims made for the project.</p>	<p>The lead agencies have worked with federal agencies since the beginning of the BDCP/California WaterFix effort and have responded to Red Flag comments throughout the process by making adjustments to the proposed project. Please also refer to the response to comment 465-1.</p>
465	19	<p>The Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS alternatives and alternatives analyses are of no value whatsoever to either decision-makers or the public. This appears to be a deliberate effort on the part of Reclamation and DWR to unlawfully evade the obligation to develop in a Draft EIR/EIS for public review and comment a range of reasonable alternatives including alternatives that would increase freshwater flows through the Delta by reducing exports and that would not include new upstream conveyance. A central feature of this intentional violation of the procedural requirements of both NEPA and the ESA is premature issuance by Reclamation of the Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS on the one hand, while with the other hand, Reclamation has deliberately failed to prepare a Biological Assessment and initiate formal ESA consultation with USFWS and NMFS.</p>	<p>Please refer to the response to comment 465-1. With regard to alternatives, please see Master Response 4.</p>
465	20	<p>As a result of violations, reasonable and prudent alternatives have not been prepared by USFWS and NMFS and are not available to the public during the BDCP and Water Fix public review and comment periods. Reclamation and DWR wish to approve the Water Tunnels in spite of their adverse impacts on Delta water quality and quantity and on endangered and threatened fish species. In contrast, the ESA requires that the project must not jeopardize endangered species or their habitat. In essence, the current Water Tunnels project/Water Fix is an unlawful attempt by Reclamation and DWR to approve the Water Tunnels in a vacuum, in the absence of reasonable and prudent alternatives that they wish to avoid but</p>	<p>Only if NMFS and/or FWS determine that the project would cause jeopardy or adversely modify critical habitat would an RPA be developed. Should the BiOp include a reasonable and prudent alternative (which would only be the case if adverse modification of designated critical habitat or jeopardy of a species was determined by NMFS or FWS to be the outcome of Alternative 4A), DWR and Reclamation would seek the necessary approvals to implement the RPA. Please refer to the response to comment 465-1. With regard to alternatives, please see Master Response 4.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>which are required by the ESA. Reasonable and prudent alternatives are also necessary to provide the NEPA required analysis of a range of reasonable alternatives. The range of reasonable alternatives required by NEPA will necessarily include the reasonable and prudent alternatives required by the ESA. We are pleased to offer EWC's A Sustainable Water Plan for California, discussed in our July 22, 2015 letter, as one example of a reasonable and prudent alternative to the Water Tunnels.[Footnote 9: <a href="http://ewccalifornia.org/reports/ewcwaterplan9-1-2015.pdf">http://ewccalifornia.org/reports/ewcwaterplan9-1-2015.pdf</a>.]</p> <p>One remedy for this unlawful process is for Reclamation to proceed to prepare a Biological Assessment and request consultation with USFWS and NMFS, and then issue a new Draft EIR/EIS for public review and comment concurrently with and integrated with the resulting Biological Opinions prepared under the ESA. The only other lawful remedy open to Reclamation and DWR is also eminently sensible: drop the Water Tunnels proposed action and focus on intelligent 21st century water solutions such as recycling, drip-irrigation, conservation, and retirement of drainage impaired lands in the San Joaquin Valley from production.</p>	
465	21	<p>In the absence of answers to basic questions including ESA questions about jeopardy of listed fish species and adverse modifications of designated critical habitats, the Draft BDCP EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS are not sufficient for informed review by the public and the decision-makers. It will be necessary at minimum under the ESA, NEPA and CEQA for the federal and state agencies to prepare, issue, and circulate for public review a new Draft EIR/EIS concurrently with and integrated with Biological Assessments and Biological Opinions. 40 C.F.R. [sections] 1502.9(a); 1502.25(a) (NEPA); 14 Cal. Code Regs., [sections] 15065(a)(1); 15088.5(a)(CEQA). Then, and only then, would the public and the decision-makers have the opportunity to engage in meaningful analysis of a preferred project alternative and informed comparison with other alternatives, including the reasonable and prudent alternatives required by the ESA.</p>	<p>The Section 7 consultation process has occurred concurrent with the development of the EIR/EIS and a ROD will not be issued until a BiOp is issued. The analysis of the preferred alternative, 4A, in the EIR/EIS is consistent with the analysis in the Biological Assessment, which was developed with input from the FWS, NMFS, and DFW.</p>
465	22	<p>[ATT 1:] The BDCP identifies several threats and stressors to the Central Valley Spring-Run Chinook Salmon, which include flow reductions causing increased water temperature and habitat elimination or degradation due to water conveyance systems. (BDCP EIR-EIS Administrative Draft, 11A-83, 11A-76 (March 2013)). The BDCP Plan admits that adverse effects of the proposed north Delta diversions on juvenile Spring-Run Chinook Salmon include near-field (physical contact with the screens and aggregation of predators) and far-field (reduced downstream flows). (Plan, ch. 5, 5. 4-16; see also RDEIR/SDEIS, p. 4.3.7-79, lines 15-17). "Plan Area flows have considerable importance for downstream migrating juvenile salmonids and will be affected by the proposed north Delta diversions . . . Because of the north Delta diversions, salmonids migrating down the Sacramento River generally will experience lower migration flows compared to existing conditions. . . As with winter-run Chinook salmon, it was assumed with high certainty that Plan Area flows have critical importance for migrating juvenile spring- run Chinook salmon." (Plan, ch. 5, 5. 4-17; BDCP Appendix 5C, Tables C.A-41 and C.A-42; see also RDEIR/SDEIS, Figures 4.3.2-7 and 4.3.2-8). Other admitted adverse effects caused by operations of the north Delta diversions include reduced attraction flows in the Sacramento River for migrating adult spring-run Chinook salmon. (Plan, ch. 5, 5. 4-19). "Lower river flow downstream of the north Delta intakes under the BDCP may reduce survival of juvenile spring- run Chinook salmon during downstream migration along the Sacramento River and also could negatively affect upstream migration of adult spring-run Chinook salmon by changing attraction flows/olfactory cues." (Plan, ch. 5, 5. 4-20). The RDEIR/SDEIS again delivers bleak prospects for the survival of this federally-protected species: "Under Alternative 4A (including climate</p>	<p>Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Species, of the FEIR/FEIS describes the projected effects of the new preferred alternative, Alternative 4A, to fish species. The analysis finds that there would be no adverse effects to salmonids from a NEPA perspective.</p> <p>The text included in the comment describes only part of the CEQA conclusions. The rest of the conclusions indicate that these findings do not consider future climate change. In doing so, it allows a fair comparison of future conditions with and without the effect of the project. As a result of this, the analysis indicates that the effects would be less than significant.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		change effects), there are flow and storage reductions, as well as temperature increases in the Sacramento River that would lead to biologically meaningful increases in egg mortality rates and overall reduced habitat conditions for spawning spring-run and egg incubation." (RDEIR/SDEIS, 4.3.7-98).	
465	23	[ATT1:] The BDCP states that threats and stressors to the Steelhead include water storage and conveyance systems as well as flow reductions contributing to increased water temperatures. (BDCP EIR-EIS Administrative Draft, 11A-129, 11A-133 (March 2013)). The Plan admits near- field (physical contact with the screens and aggregation of predators) and far-field (reduced downstream flows leading to greater probability of predation) effects of the north Delta diversions on juvenile Sacramento River Region Steelhead. (Plan, ch. 5, 5. 6-11; see also RDEIR/SDEIS, p. 4.3.7-199, lines 1-6). The plan also admits that "Sacramento River attraction flows for migrating adult Sacramento River region steelhead will be lower from operations of the north Delta diversions under the BDCP." (Plan, ch. 5, 5. 6-13; BDCP Appendix 5C, Tables C.A-41 and C.A-42; see also RDEIR/SDEIS, Figures 4.3.2-7 and 4.3.2-8). The Plan admits that respect to the Feather River, "the reduction in flows in the high-flow channel due to BDCP would reduce conditions in an already unsuitable habitat." (Plan, ch. 5. 6-16). The RDEIR/SDEIS states: "In general, Alternative 4A would degrade the quantity and quality of rearing habitat for steelhead relative to Existing Conditions." (RDEIR/SDEIS, 4.3.7-22).	Portions of the comment are taken from the administrative draft that did not evaluate Alternative 4A. Additionally, the final statement refers to a CEQA comparison that does not take into account climate change effects. The evaluation of Alternative 4A, including the parameters noted in the comment, is included in Chapter 11.
465	24	[ATT1:] The BDCP identifies increased water temperatures and habitat loss as threats and stressors to the Green Sturgeon. BDCP EIR-EIS Administrative Draft, 11A-162 - 65 (March 2013). With respect to admitted adverse effects, the Plan admits that flow changes will reduce transport and migration flows in the Feather River and Plan area. (Plan, ch. 5. 8-17 through 8-24). "As such [reduction in early fall releases], average in stream flows during some months of the three periods identified above (June-September, August-October, August-June) are expected to substantially decline in the Feather River at Thermalito and moderately decline in the Sacramento River at Verona under the BDCP, especially for the LOS [low-outflow scenario] (Appendix 5.C, flow, passage, salinity, and turbidity, section 5.C.5.3.3, High Outflow and Low Outflow Scenarios)." (Plan, ch. 5. 5. 8-18). Also, the plan admits that "there is [on the Feather River] the potential for appreciable change in the Feather River as a result of operational differences between the BDCP scenarios and future conditions without the BDCP (EBC2_LLT)." (Plan, ch. 5, 5. 8-24). The RDEIR/SDEIS states: "In general, Alternative 4A would reduce the quantity and quality of rearing habitat for larval and juvenile green sturgeon relative to Existing Conditions." (RDEIR/SDEIS, 4.3.7-296).	Portions of the comment are based on the analysis conducted for Alternatives 1A and 4, which are not the preferred alternative. Additionally, the final statement refers to a CEQA comparison that does not take into account climate change effects. The evaluation of Alternative 4A, including the parameters noted in the comment, is included in Chapter 11.
465	25	[ATT1:] The BDCP identifies several threats and stressors to the Delta Smelt, including water exports and increased water temperature. (BDCP EIR-EIS Administrative Draft, 11A-8-11 (March 2013)). Admitted adverse effects caused by the BDCP north Delta intakes include reducing the quantity of sediment entering the Plan Area thus increasing water clarity and negatively affecting delta smelt. (Plan, ch. 5, 5. 1-30; see also RDEIR/SDEIS, p. 4.3.7-26, 4.3.7-29). Greater water residence time from changes in water operations will likely increase the toxic blue-green alga Microcystis having both direct and indirect effects on the smelt. (Plan, Chapter 5, 5. 1-32; BDCP, Appendix 5C, p. 5.4-14; RDEIR/SDEIS, Chapter 8, Table 8-60a). North Delta intakes' operations will introduce and increase entrainment and impingement of Delta smelt as well as introduce and increase predation hotspots in and around the new intakes (RDEIR/SDEIS, p. 4.3.7-24, lines 4-7).	Portions of the comment are based on the analysis conducted for Alternatives 1A and 4, which are not the preferred alternative. Additionally, the final statement refers to a CEQA comparison that does not take into account climate change effects. The evaluation of Alternative 4A, including the parameters noted in the comment, is included in Chapter 11. For delta smelt, entrainment and predation is likely to decrease overall because of dual conveyance allowing water diversion from the north Delta intakes (where delta smelt are less common) as opposed to the south Delta export facilities. Please refer to Master Response 14 regarding Microcystis.
469	1	I wish to voice my comment on why the tunnel project you propose would not be good for the people of northern California. I was born and raised in San Francisco and during my	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>youth enjoyed the Delta. I saw the Corps of Engineers come through and trip banks all along the Delta. I saw the canal dug from Byron to southern California, all to be done to help the people of northern California. Enough is enough.</p> <p>The fishing in the Delta has steadily gone downhill and sending water south would do nothing for the farmers or the fish. Use the outrageous amount of money to improve the storage we so badly need and improve the existing rivers and streams.</p>	<p>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>
470	1	<p>I have personally spoken with the CEOs of the companies that would bid on this project. They've communicated that this is the most extravagantly expensive way to move water, the least reliable, and will be a nightmare to fix. One CEO said off the record, their companies will benefit financially, but it is "the biggest tax payer boondoggle I've ever seen."</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such 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 cost and funding sources please see Master Response 5.</p>
471	1	<p>I oppose the Delta Tunnels Project. No planning to include future problems and [it] certainly destroys habitat in the Delta.</p> <p>Please record my protest against [it].</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>
472	1	<p>I read the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California Water Fix Partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report/Supplemental Draft Environment Impact Statement.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the construction of the water tunnels, which will divert water from the Delta to the Central Valley and to Southern California. The farmers in the Central Valley have continued to be extremely irresponsible in the way they use water. They are sucking the aquifer dry and there is has been no stringent legislation to ration water and to distribute it in a limited and equitable fashion. The farmers are continuing to uproot crops that use limited water and replacing them with almond and pistachio trees that require huge amounts of water. Whenever I've driven through the Central Valley, I see almond orchards that are flooded.</p>	<p>The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. 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.</p>
472	2	<p>The citizens of Northern California have done an excellent job in heeding the governor's directive to conserve water. In our own household, our water use has decreased by 46.6% from our use in 2013. In Northern California we have exceeded the call for reducing water use by 25%. Are the citizens really scrimping and saving so the Central Valley farmers can squander it?</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The SWP and CVP operations under the action alternatives would only deliver water under existing water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board to DWR and Reclamation for use by the SWP and CVP. 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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.
472	3	I am extremely dismayed that this project has had no involvement from the legislature. Shouldn't such a massive water project be decided by the people of California or by the legislature? Instead, it has all been planned behind closed doors by certain interest groups that have clearly ignored the wishes of the public. The public already spoke on the issue two decades ago when we voted against the Peripheral Canal.	This comment is an opinion that the proposed project should be legislated or put to public vote. No comments on the contents of the EIR/EIS or environmental review process are identified. Please refer to Master Responses 39 and 40 for an overview of the public review process and the public outreach program for this project.
472	4	The harm to the San Francisco Bay and to several fish species has been clearly delineated by many environmental organizations and by the federal government. I respectfully urge Governor Brown to rescind this harmful project.	Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on costs and benefits. The project would cost approximately \$15 billion to build (not \$50 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.
473	1	<p>The members of Yolo MoveOn urge [Governor] Brown to please reconsider his support of the Delta Tunnels. Our members live in Davis, Dixon, Fairfield and Woodland. Each of our communities is closely tied to the Delta in multiple ways.</p> <p>The economic and environmental vitality of the Delta is important to us, physically, psychologically, financially and socially. There are 4 million people living in the Delta, with a \$6B recreation and farming economy, dependent on Delta water quality and quantity, which also is the life source for the San Francisco Bay Estuary.</p> <p>The proposed twin tunnels will take up to two-thirds of the fresh water from the Sacramento River to send to private Big Agriculture growing water-intensive crops in the desert. It is estimated that the cost of the Delta Tunnels project will be in the \$60 billion. Nearly a quarter of a billion dollars has been spent on this plan so far to move water that is already oversubscribed.</p>	<p>The proposed project provide about the same amount of water as compared to the last 20 years of deliveries but include operational flexibility with the use of the North Delta intakes, as described in Final EIR/EIS Chapter 5, Water Supplies, and Chapter 6, Surface Water.</p> <p>The construction of the water delivery facilities is estimated to cost \$14.9 billion, an amount that would be paid for by the state and federal water contractors who rely on Delta exports. The range of costs for water vary widely among contractors south of the Delta. Costs depend on the source of water, transport facilities, energy requirements, among other factors. For the agricultural customers of the CVP, prices range from \$100 per acre-foot to more than \$400 per acre-foot. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, which buys water from the SWP, estimates that the cost of the proposed project would translate into about \$5.00 extra per household, per month in its service area. The final cost of water from the new conveyance facilities would be determined by numerous factors. A number of these significant factors, such as the project yield and allocation of costs, have yet to be determined. Please see Master Response 5 for information regarding funding of the proposed project.</p>
473	2	The proposed Tunnels plan would displace farmers for 14 years and put coastal fishermen out of work. Construction and heavy equipment will be devastating for fish and wildlife. Boron, selenium and other heavy metals from the San Joaquin River will be carried into the Delta, compromising the drinking water of Contra Costa County.	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The Lead Agencies discuss community character in Chapter 16 of the Final 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. See also Master Response 24: Alternative 4A (Proposed Project) Evaluation of the Delta as a Place.</p>
473	3	Every day this year water quality standards for the Delta have been violated by the state. They have allowed water exporters to pump too much water out of the Delta during the drought. Plus, the water exporters have never been forced to pay for the fish screens that they were required to provide at the existing water export pumps near Tracy. With declining fish populations, such negligence is irresponsible and reprehensible. The area's salmon have	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. Water quality is evaluated in Chapter 8 of the Final EIR/EIS and additional information can be found in Master Response 14. Please see also Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Resources and Master Response 17.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		already declined 90% in the last three years of drought. Further, habitat restoration that was originally part of the Tunnel plan cannot replace the fresh water that salmon, smelt, sturgeon, and American shad need to survive.	
473	4	With this massive, expensive and environmentally damaging plan, Yolo MoveOn members want to know where the actual water for the Tunnels will come from. What will that do to the water source area? How long are water exports from northern California supplies sustainable? Has there been an analysis of the economic and environmental impacts on those regions?	<p>In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the Final EIR/EIS), 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.</p> <p>Changes in environmental conditions in the physical, biological, and human resources for the conditions under the proposed project and the other action alternatives as compared to Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative are presented in this EIR/EIS, including surface water modeling results in Final EIR/EIS Appendix 5A, Section C. Socioeconomic issues are analyzed as discussed in Chapter 16 of the Final EIR/EIS. For further information regarding socioeconomic effects, see also Master Response 24, Evaluation of Delta as a Place.</p>
473	5	[Yolo MoveOn] would like to know how much water will be available for export through the tunnels in a drought, after prior water rights and public trust needs are met. If there isn't any, how often will the tunnels be dry? This consideration seems particularly critical when predictions are for more droughts and less snow pack in the future as climate change progresses.	<p>The total amount of water exported by month in each water year type for each action alternative is presented in Final EIR/EIS Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Model Results, of the EIR/EIS. As shown in Appendix 5A, 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.</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>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>
473	6	[Yolo MoveOn] understand[s] that the majority of habitat designated for restoration under California EcoRestore is for prior damage. How can that help with habitat restoration and mitigation for the tunnels?	California EcoRestore habitat restoration is separate from the California WaterFix (Alternative 4A) and would not directly reduce any of the impacts of Alternative 4A. All of the habitat restoration and other actions required to reduce effects of the Alternative 4A water conveyance facilities is included in the

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
473	7	Will the state conduct a full cost-benefit analysis of the project that includes the value of freshwater to the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary?	<p>description of Environmental Commitments for this alternative.</p> <p>The incremental changes in Delta outflow under Alternative 4A compared to baseline conditions are a function of both the facility and operations assumptions, including north Delta intakes capacity of 9,000 cfs, OMR flow requirements, Fall X2 requirements, and the reduction in water supply availability due to increased north of Delta urban demands, sea level rise, and climate change (the last three assumptions, plus Fall X2 requirements, are included in both the No Action Alternative (ELT) and Alternative 4A, but not in Existing Conditions). Results for the range of changes in Delta outflow under Alternative 4A are presented in more detail in Appendix 5A, BDCP/California WaterFix EIR/S Modeling Technical Appendix. Changes in long-term average Delta outflow under Alternative 4A (ELT) as compared to the No Action Alternative (ELT) and Existing Conditions are shown in Figures 5-37 through 5-39 and Tables 5-10 through 5-12 in Final EIR/EIS Chapter 5.</p> <p>To summarize changes in Delta outflow under Alternative 4A, late-fall and winter outflows remain similar or show minor reductions in Alternative 4A (ELT) compared to No Action Alternative (ELT) and are slightly higher relative to Existing Conditions. In the spring months, outflow would remain similar under Alternative 4A (ELT) as compared to No Action Alternative (ELT), and would be slightly reduced compared to Existing Conditions. In the fall months, outflow under Alternative 4A would increase relative to Existing Conditions, and as compared to the No Action Alternative (ELT), would be similar because of Fall X2 requirements in wet and above-normal years.</p> <p>An updated cost-benefit analysis will be prepared outside of the CEQA/NEPA process.</p>
473	8	In the absence of answers to important questions, Yolo MoveOn members strongly urge that the Tunnels project be permanently shelved and a more comprehensive, equitable, and environmentally sensitive water policy be adopted.	<p>The commenter's opinion is noted. The alternatives included in the Draft EIR/EIS and Final EIR/EIS represent a legally adequate reasonable range of alternatives and the scope of the analysis of alternatives fully complies with both CEQA and NEPA. The Lead Agencies carefully considered all potential alternatives that were proposed during the scoping process and during time of preparation of the EIR/EIS. In fact, as a direct result of the extensive public comments and agency input, the water facility and conveyance options proposed as part of the project changed significantly during the planning process in ways that reduce impacts in the Delta communities. Additional unique Alternatives that were proposed during review of Administrative Drafts of the BDCP and EIR/S were also considered and described, See Appendix 3A of the EIR/EIS and Section 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS, as well as Master Response 4 (Alternatives).</p>
474	1	Governor Jerry Brown's California twin tunnels project (California WaterFix) will not create or save water. The project will not solve California's water problems, drought or no drought. Instead, it will cause a host of new problems, and it will pull away money that could be used for right-sized, targeted local projects that would provide solutions.	<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>
474	2	The twin tunnels project is an engineering experiment, not a sound plan. The tunnels will require a bore 32 miles long at a depth of 150 feet in very challenging soils. It is a much bigger and more complex project than Seattle's Big Bertha dig -- and that project is two years behind schedule and way over budget, and has progressed only 1,100 feet.	<p>Please note that the proposed 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>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<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> <p>The alternatives included in the Draft EIR/EIS and Final EIR/EIS represent a legally adequate reasonable range of alternatives and the scope of the analysis of alternatives fully complies with both CEQA and NEPA. The Lead Agencies carefully considered all potential alternatives that were proposed during the scoping process and during time of preparation of the EIR/EIS. In fact, as a direct result of the extensive public comments and agency input, the water facility and conveyance options proposed as part of the project changed significantly during the planning process in ways that reduce impacts in the Delta communities. Additional unique Alternatives that were proposed during review of Administrative Drafts of the BDCP and EIR/EIS were also considered and described, See Appendix 3A of the EIR/EIS and Section 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Please also refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives) for additional information.</p>
474	3	The twin tunnels will have the capacity to take in more than 100% of the current average flow of the Sacramento River, potentially stopping all freshwater flow into San Francisco Bay. Most of the diverted water will be delivered to unsustainable orchards in southern San Joaquin County.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The SWP and CVP operations under the action alternatives would only deliver water under existing water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board to DWR and Reclamation for use by the SWP and CVP.</p> <p>The EIR/S modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.</p> <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>
474	4	Likely environmental results of the twin tunnels project are the collapse of the Sacramento-San Joaquin-San Francisco Bay ecosystem, elimination of salmon and most other native fish species, reduction of endangered bird populations, periodic toxicity of shellfish, massive fish kills in San Francisco Bay, weeds and stagnant water along shorelines, and permanent disruption of offshore ecology.	<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>
474	5	Predictable economic outcomes include severe effects on San Francisco's tourist and convention industries; a loss of appeal for the Bay Area as a site for new business location; a reduction of property values in communities near waterways; and an end to farming, sportfishing, and seasonal work in the Delta, Stockton, and adjacent areas of the Sacramento Valley.	Please refer to Alternative 4A in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, Impact ECON-1 regarding temporary effects on regional economics and employment, ECON-3 regarding changes in community character, ECON-4 regarding changes in local government fiscal conditions, and ECON-6 regarding agricultural economics. Please see Master Response 17 regarding striped bass.
474	6	The original version of the twin tunnels plan--the Bay Delta Conservation Plan--was rejected last fall by the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Environmental Protection Agency. These and other federal agencies criticized the application's faulty science and fuzzy economics. Instead of modifying the plan, the Governor has stripped out almost all funds for mitigation of damage and has re-submitted the same win tunnels plan under a new name.	The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A. Alternative 4A reflects the State's proposal to separate the conveyance facility and habitat restoration measures into two separate efforts: California WaterFix and California EcoRestore. The proposed project includes habitat restoration as necessary to mitigate significant environmental effects and satisfy applicable ESA and CESA standards. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<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>
474	7	The Governor has kept residents uninformed of the true nature of his plan, has suppressed and ignored public comment, and has refused to consider better, cheaper, less destructive alternative plans -- all violations of law. He has structured the twin tunnels plan so the project can go forward without a vote of the legislature or of the people.	The commenter raises issues related to public education, public commenting, the range of alternatives considered, and the project's approval process. Please refer to Master Response 40 regarding the extensive public outreach efforts for the project. Please refer to Master Response 42 regarding the treatment of comments. Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the proposed project. Finally, please refer to Master Response 4 regarding alternatives considered.
474	8	The twin tunnels project will be the biggest waste of public money in the history of California -- \$40 billion to \$60 billion in total costs.	The project would cost approximately \$15 billion to build. There would be additional costs for mitigation of approximately \$800 million. Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on the costs of project implementation.
474	9	As a resident and registered voter of California, I demand that the twin tunnels plan be rejected. We need instead to bring together experts in all relevant fields to develop a plan that really does address California's water problems going forward, and does so in ways that conserve our financial resources and protect our wildlife, water quality, and environment.	<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>
476	1	Please do not move forward with the Delta tunnel project.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
476	2	We do not need a further intrusion of salt water which would occur if fresh water is routed south. We should not be bypassing the environmental impact of 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/EIS.
476	3	We have far more important uses of our construction dollars than buying up family farms and putting those families out of work.  Please put a halt to this project.	This comment expresses concern about loss of property associated with the California WaterFix conveyance facilities. DWR does not take the issue of Delta property acquisition lightly. The effects of California WaterFix on existing land uses are disclosed in Chapter 13, Land Use. Compensation associated with property acquisition is addressed generally in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics of the EIR/EIS.
477	1	Please find my opposition letter regarding the Delta Tunnels / Water Fix (Alternative 2A).  As a native of the Sacramento region, this project is a sham to our people and a detriment to our ancient Delta waterways!	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<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>
478	1	<p>Our state is turning into a 4th world country! Please help!</p> <p>There is plenty of water in the state, we just have to retain it, move it and store it in the areas where it is needed. We need cities, we need agriculture, we need to protect the environment, and we need to make sure all of our citizens have a sustainable water supply.</p>	<p>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.</p>
478	2	<p>Water is a basic necessity and it is an essential function of governmental agencies to ensure that all of our citizens have water. Your agencies have produced a good plan, so please stop talking and start working on getting the job done.</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
478	3	<p>I am a proud hardworking Californian, but as an individual I cannot create a better water system. When we the people, with our governmental officials and governmental agencies, work together we can accomplish big things. The water system from the 1960s was brilliant and millions of our citizens have benefited from the project. The present and future for myself and millions of people depend on your decisions and actions.</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
478	4	<p>At this point millions of people trust you, our government officials; please find a way to get the water issues resolved, so we can continue to live in the 1st world California.</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>
479	1	<p>Please leave alone our Delta. I live on Bethel Island and the currents have changed. Tides are very low. Leave the Delta alone.</p>	<p>Since the late 1800s, the Bay-Delta ecosystem has been substantially altered. Changes in key environmental attributes of the Bay-Delta have contributed to the current degraded state of the ecosystem and appear to be proximate causes of declines in desired fishes and increases in non-native species. California WaterFix is not intended to address all the factors that have contributed to the Delta's decline and briefly summarizes a few but not all of those factors. Many factors that have contributed to the decline of the Delta's ecosystem including the conversion of tidal marsh and floodplains to farmland, construction of levees and altering of tide flows, in-Delta and upstream water diversions, contaminant discharges, ammonia and nutrient discharges and changes to the food web, increases in water temperatures, and introduction of non-native and invasive species. The Delta will remain in a highly altered state for the foreseeable future and the project is not intended to address all the past harms or restore the Delta to a pre-altered state. Please refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place).</p>
480	1	<p>The California Delta region from Sacramento to Stockton across towards the Bay area is a tranquil oasis for many species. Birds, fish and yes humans, come and or live in this area for its beauty and bounty. The proposed Delta diversion tunnels will destroy this unique habitat.</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
480	2	The use of eminent domain to seize family held farms should be outlawed. These beautiful and pastoral farms contribute to one of things that make California so special. The variety and abundance of locally grown fruits, nuts and vegetables will be destroyed.	This comment is an opinion about the use of eminent domain for property acquisition. While some loss of agricultural land will occur related to construction of the water conveyance facilities, the amount of agricultural land for Alternative 4A has been minimized as much as possible and provides mitigation measures to reduce potential effects on Delta agricultural productivity.
480	3	The winter homes of migratory will be destroyed. Their nesting places destroyed.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
480	4	Please abandon this destructive plan. If we lose the Delta, we will never be able to replace it.	<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>
481	1	As homeowners on Bethel Island, we are appalled with the idea of taking our water to better irrigation in central California. This is a hardship for [the] central area, but as news has reported we are in a hardship. I vote no for the continuance of [Governor] Brown's tunnel project.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The SWP and CVP operations under the action alternatives would only deliver water under existing water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board to DWR and Reclamation for use by the SWP and CVP. 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.
482	1	<p>I hate anything that directs water to southern California. The tunnels will affect too many people in [the] Delta, their property, homes, [and] farms. Taking land from people is a horrible way to do things.</p> <p>No no no no no tunnels.</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.
483	1	If what I read is true, I will pray that God intervenes in this hideous plot to remove generational farmers from their land, to ruin one of the most lovely and natural places in North America and to cause an enormous imbalance in our ecosystem for the intended purpose "to take." Greed is a destroyer and what you are about to participate in is simply that. There are water handling alternatives to consider so that everyone benefits. We have been given a precious jewel from God. He gave us the responsibility of caring for it. Please reconsider and do what is ethical and beneficial to all.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</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>Impacts to agriculture are identified and discussed in Chapter 14; Lead Agencies have proposed measures that would support and protect agricultural production in the Delta by securing agricultural easements and/or by seeking opportunities to protect and enhance agriculture with a focus on maintaining economic</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			activity on agricultural lands. See Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation).
484	1	Absolutely the worst idea ever heard of. Don't have to be an engineer to see this. Please drop this insane idea!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
485	1	I oppose the building of these tunnels, as it will destroy this beautiful Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
486	1	<p>Having lived and worked -- managing a number of agriculture and recreation based businesses -- in the California Delta area since 1998, and as a lifetime resident of the state, I see very little positive impact on our state water resources from the construction of the proposed Delta tunnels.</p> <p>a) The tunnels will not increase our state's water supply or reserves (aka: storage)</p> <p>b) The tunnels will not recharge our critical natural aquifers</p> <p>c) The tunnels will not improve the environment, the wetlands, the fisheries, or the quality of Delta and San Francisco Bay waters</p> <p>d) The tunnels will not create or promote any long-term economic benefit to the Delta or San Francisco Bay areas</p> <p>Quite the contrary -- the tunnels will have significant negative impacts on all of the above -- and, at a total cost of \$30 billion (give or take 10 or 20), the project can only be defined as a perfect example of boondoggle politics.</p> <p>The effort and money to be expended on the project would be far better spent on a) desalination technology and development (for those areas taking the water); b) water conservation and reclamation technology and projects; c) water resources storage and aquifer recharge projects; and d) Delta and Bay Area environmental and water quality projects.</p> <p>Take a look at Mono Lake, the Salton Sea, and the Colorado River if you want to see what these Tunnels will accomplish.</p>	<p>Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria 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> <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>Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the project would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding desalination.</p>
487	1	I cannot understand how you intend to have five intakes of water out of the Sacramento River and still have enough flow of water left to flow down the Sacramento River to effectively keep the salt water from intruding up the river and destroy the quality of the river water along the river for farming purposes?	The potential for water conveyance operations to affect salinity conditions in the Delta (including Suisun Marsh) under existing conditions and future no action conditions, and with implementation of each project alternative (including conservation measures), is assessed in detail in Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the EIR/EIS for the salinity-related parameters bromide (Impact WQ-5), chloride (Impact WQ-7), and electrical conductivity (Impact WQ-11). Where significant impacts to water quality would occur due to the alternative, mitigation to lessen those impacts is provided.
487	2	With less flow of water the river will certainly drop more sediment with a slower flow of water and fill the channel faster than it is filling with sediment over the past 75 plus years.	As discussed in Chapter 8, Water Quality, in Impact WQ-29, the project alternatives would have a less than significant impact to TSS and turbidity, and the river flows (highs, lows, averages) in the rivers upstream of the Delta would be similar to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative.
488	1	As a resident and registered voter of California, I demand that the twin tunnels plan be rejected. We need instead to bring together experts in all relevant fields to develop a plan that really does address California's water problems going forward, and does so in ways that conserve our financial resources and protect our wildlife, water quality, and environment.	<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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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>
488	2	<p>The twin tunnels will cost the public about \$40-\$50 billion and not create any new water.</p>	<p>In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods.</p> <p>The construction of the water delivery facilities is estimated to cost \$14.9 billion, an amount that would be paid for by the state and federal water contractors who rely on Delta exports. The range of costs for water vary widely among contractors south of the Delta. Costs depend on the source of water, transport facilities, energy requirements, among other factors. For the agricultural customers of the CVP, prices range from \$100 per acre-foot to more than \$400 per acre-foot. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, which buys water from the SWP, estimates that the cost of the proposed project would translate into about \$5.00 extra per household, per month in its service area. The final cost of water from the new conveyance facilities would be determined by numerous factors. A number of these significant factors, such as the project yield and allocation of costs, have yet to be determined. Please see Master Response 5 for information regarding funding of the proposed project</p>
488	3	<p>The original version of the twin tunnels plan--the Bay Delta Conservation Plan--was rejected last fall by the National Academy of Sciences, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Environmental Protection Agency. These and other federal agencies criticized the application's faulty science and fuzzy economics. Instead of modifying the plan, the Governor has stripped out almost all funds for mitigation of damage and has re-submitted the same twin tunnels plan under a new name.</p>	<p>The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A. Alternative 4A reflects the State's proposal to separate the conveyance facility and habitat restoration measures into two separate efforts: California WaterFix and California EcoRestore. The proposed project includes habitat restoration as necessary to mitigate significant environmental effects and satisfy applicable ESA and CESA standards. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative.</p> <p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
488	4	The twin tunnels will have the capacity to take in more than 100% of the current average flow of the Sacramento River, potentially stopping all freshwater flow into San Francisco Bay. Most of the diverted water will be delivered to unsustainable orchards in southern San Joaquin County.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Operation of the project water delivery system could not drain the Delta rivers and channels dry, including the Sacramento River. The project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see <a href="http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml">http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml</a>) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see <a href="http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html">http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html</a>).</p> <p>The EIR/S modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.</p>
488	5	Likely environmental results of the twin tunnels project are the collapse of the Sacramento-San Joaquin-San Francisco Bay ecosystem, elimination of salmon and most other native fish species, reduction of endangered bird populations, periodic toxicity of shellfish, massive fish kills in San Francisco Bay, weeds and stagnant water along shorelines, and permanent disruption of offshore ecology.	<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 17 (Biological Resources).</p>
488	6	Predictable economic outcomes include severe effects on San Francisco's tourist and convention industries; a loss of appeal for the Bay Area as a site for new business location; a reduction of property values in communities near waterways; and an end to farming, sport fishing, and seasonal work in the Delta, Stockton, and adjacent areas of the Sacramento Valley.	Please refer to Alternative 4A in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, Impact ECON-1 regarding temporary effects on regional economics and employment, ECON-3 regarding changes in community character, ECON-4 regarding changes in local government fiscal conditions, and ECON-6 regarding agricultural economics. Please see Master Response 17 regarding striped bass.
488	7	We have seen the results of the current lack of run off from the drought, increased river bottom weeds and water hyacinth. This plan will destroy the water quality and the ecosystem of the Sacramento River, Delta and San Francisco Bay.	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.
489	1	I want you to know I strongly oppose the construction of the Delta Tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
490	1	<p>I am a recently retired public policy analyst who happens to have been active in the recreational scene of the Delta for more than 50 years. As a policy analyst I understand the need to take into account the full range of water needs of the state. I also understand the seismic challenges Delta levees face. And, as a user and enjoyer of the Delta I understand the needs of this unique waterway if it is to continue playing its multiple roles of providing water to [agricultural] and urban users, a place of recreation and a home to fish and wildlife.</p> <p>The Delta has changed dramatically in the past two decades. Water intakes are up, recreation offerings are down as invasive species have taken over and levees have been or are being improved in the most critical areas at great expense.</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. Appendix 1C of the Final EIR/EIS, Demand Management Measures, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. Refer to Master Response 6 for more information on demand management. Although components such as desalination plants and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the State, they are beyond the scope of the project. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Any further impacts to this fragile place are sure to completely upend the balance of use which is now the case. The tunnels and their massive water diversion will add impacts sure to do further harm to recreation, to fish and to other wildlife. Water managers need to pursue the other avenues passed by voters in Props 1 and 2 last year. These measures take into account the water needs of the entire state and all users. Levees continue to be strengthened where feasible. Others can be abandoned over time. But we must take the tunnels out of the picture or risk upending the whole situation.</p>	<p>Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 24 for details on the Delta as a place, including the impacts to Delta recreation and community character.</p>
491	1	<p>Once again Jerry Brown seems to be pandering to big corporate interests by proposing to destroy the Delta and 300 farms with his ill-conceived tunnel plan.</p> <p>At the moment, California's reservoirs fed from the rivers he proposes to tap, are nearly empty: Shasta, Folsom, Oroville, to name a few. The gigantic San Luis reservoir near Los Banos has been dry for several years.</p> <p>It's time to wake up [and] accept the very real limits to water supply in this desert land we call California. Planting crops that require enormous quantities of irrigation water is irresponsible. Yes, we need farms and fresh, local food. But not gigantic corporate mega-farms. Sending food produced by strained local resources to China benefits only one corporation, not the people of California who will subsidize water for his massive plantings.</p> <p>Excess water consumption has very real consequences, such as land subsidence, that threaten infrastructure and the quality of life for all the people of California.</p> <p>Surely tree nuts could be watered with recycled, treated wastewater. Let China grow their own nuts. Cotton is best grown in Mississippi and other water abundant areas, not in a land of expanding drought.</p> <p>To destroy 300 family farms in the Delta by eminent domain to subsidize water for one corporate farm is evil.</p> <p>Do not allocate my tax dollars, or any other public money, for this horrible tunnel project.</p>	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p> <p>The comment is in opposition to large corporate mega-farms that export using water diverted from the Delta. Additionally, the comment recommends the conversion to using recycled water for irrigation. At this time, most areas in the Delta are not located in proximity to any available recycled water facilities.</p> <p>From a Statewide perspective, the water agencies throughout the state have developed portfolios to provide the necessary water for their region. The solution to the State's water problem is multi-faceted and will include multiple actions throughout the state. Ways to reduce demand are in process at this time. Various programs for storage, reuse and added reliability are being evaluated and implemented. Those actions do not provide the entire solution; therefore, the project is being proposed as one of the pieces of the overall program. However, the neither State nor Federal government has the authority to dictate action by the various water entities</p> <p>Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 6 (Demand Management) and Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
492	1	<p>I live in Porterville, California and if there is any place that has a shortage of water problem it is Porterville. I don't think that the Delta should be destroyed, which is exactly what will happen if these tunnels are constructed and used to divert water. Jerry Brown has a lot of expensive ideas of what the State of California needs. Maybe water can be transported where it is needed on his senseless high speed train.</p>	<p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria 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>
493	1	<p>When planning for this environmental disaster was taking place, I wonder if anyone considered what withdrawal of 9,000 cubic feet of water per second would do to the water levels in the San Joaquin river shipping channel. It seems to me that it would effectively put the Port of Stockton out of business, at least during drought years.</p>	<p>Impacts TRANS-12 and TRANS-13 discuss impacts on navigation due to changes in water elevation, including periods of lowest river flows.</p> <p>Because it does not involve a physical change in the environment, effects to navigation caused by changes in surface water elevation, by themselves, are not considered environmental impacts under CEQA. Any secondary physical environmental impacts that may result are covered under other impacts. Nonetheless, as explained above, changes in surface water elevation during operation of the intakes will not have a</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			significant impact on navigation.
493	2	[ATT1: California Delta Chambers and Vistor's Bureau newsletter dated September 2015.]	This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
494	1	This entire project is a disaster! It should be abandoned immediately. It does not create any new water, only takes more from the Delta than is already being done. It will cause further salt water incursion into the Delta and harm already compromised habitat. Please do not continue to spend my taxpayer dollars on this boondoggle.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS.
495	1	I have major objections to this environment-damaging idea. The California WaterFix does not address the environmental, public health or economic impacts of the proposed Delta tunnels project. The plan ignores alternatives that would save California tax and ratepayers billions of dollars, while investing in the jobs and local water sources that build sustainability.	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.
496	1	This is a terrible idea. It will wreck our own water supply, fish and wildlife habitat, and recreation in northern California. I am opposed to spending any state funds on this harmful endeavor. Please stop it now. All of my friends can't believe our state government would do this to us.	Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.  DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.
497	1	Common sense tells all of us that the Delta tunnels are wrong. Our Governor should be impeached and those politicians supporting this plan should be fired.	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.
498	1	As residents of the Delta, we are strongly opposed to [Governor] Brown's Bay Delta Conservation Plan on building twin tunnels which will alter and harm the health 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 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 improved water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
499	1	The plans to ignore public opinion and divert additional water from the Delta and all that goes along with it are another fine example of the governmental overreach and cronyism that publicly funded agencies and California are rightly famous for. The prevailing attitude that public sector employees are able to trample on ordinary people's lives and spend millions of other people's money is contemptible and does nothing to improve the public's beliefs that the bureaucrats are not listening.  As a boater who uses the Delta frequently I strongly urge you not to proceed with your plans for the tunnels, land grabs and relocations.	Please see Master Response 13 related to development of proposed project in accordance with the California Constitution and "beneficial and reasonable use" criteria. Also see Master Response 41 on transparency and public involvement.