

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4000	1	We need to learn within our means and stop manipulating the planet for our own greed. We can take the pain in the meanwhile and expand alternatives rapidly and develop new technologies. We can do it. Now.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4001	1	Experts have shown us that the project will be more detrimental to the area than solve a problem as stated by Jerry Brown's buddies.	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.
4002	1	The ecological impact of the tunnels will be irreversible. The farmers in the south are trying to turn desert into orange groves. That will never sustain. If the south wants water, get it from somewhere that doesn't kill off species and damage salmon reproduction.	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), Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply), and Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
4003	1	To build the tunnels would be a certain death to the California Delta as we know it today, all of the fresh water wildlife would disappear.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4004	1	These tunnels appear to be destructive and unsustainable.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4005	1	I oppose any plan to take more fresh water out of the Delta water ways.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports).
4006	1	I don't believe the California Water Fix is right for California. Solving one problem by creating another one is insane.	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.
4007	1	I want to protect our source of water, the environment, and wildlife.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4008	1	We cannot magically create more water by digging tunnels under the Delta. The water released into the Delta is necessary to keep the Delta alive. People have no right to destroy a vital resource like the Sacramento River Delta. If the only way our economy can survive is by growing then our economy is nothing but a cancer on the earth. I choose not to be part of a cancer. There are alternatives. People can live in harmony with the planet that sustains us. We do not have to destroy our home in the name of greed and profits. Greed must be treated like the crime it is. And we need to stop breeding like mindless rodents. Already we have more people than the earth can sustain. We don't have to be a mindless and greedy species. We can only survive by living in balance with the other species on this planet and using resources only as fast as they can be replaced or renewed. If we are honest we know this is true. We will perish if the web of life collapses. So no, don't take more water than the Delta needs to survive. Our survival as a species depends on the survival of Earth's web of life. We have to stop	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).

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		being a cancer.	
4009	1	I'm signing this because there are far better ways to answer the water crisis. This sounds like a Big Business and corporate greed solution.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Therefore, this project is not the result of "favoring" large corporations (e.g., large agribusinesses and oil companies). In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
4010	1	We need to protect our ecology.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4011	1	The Tunnel plan is a giant boondoggle set up to keep the Democrats in office with all of the union jobs. The union workers must pay union dues. Part of their dues goes to political donations.	<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 45 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
4011	2	Removing the fresh water from the Delta so far up north allows the ocean salt water to reach farther into the Delta, destroying the natural Delta environment. In addition you can not grow crops with salt water.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
4012	1	If we're oversubscribing the water we have got to stop. The weather is unpredictable at best. We can't spend resources we don't have!	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Water rights issued on rivers in the Trinity and Central Valley watersheds include a wide range of beneficial uses from hydropower to municipal, industrial, and agricultural water users. However, not all of the water diverted under the water rights is consumptively used. For example, water diverted for hydropower electric generation is fully returned to the water bodies; and a portion of the water diverted from municipal, industrial, and agricultural water uses is returned to the water bodies. In addition, the amount of water diverted is dependent upon water rights priorities and the need to meet environmental flow and quality requirements. Therefore, it is difficult to compare the total volume of water rights licenses to the total amount of water available in the system. For example, water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation are not fully available to provide water under the SWP and CVP water contracts in many years due to the demands of senior water rights holders and regulatory requirements.</p> <p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.
4013	1	I'm signing because the Delta tunnels will destroy the Delta and San Francisco Bay due to diverting most of the clean water coming in to Southern California agriculture. The fishing and farming in the Delta communities will be virtually destroyed.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply). See Final EIR/EIS Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, Impact AG-1 and Impact AG-2 and their mitigation to mediate important farmland in the Delta.
4014	1	I'm signing because it is not the will of the people, it will cause environmental damage, increases public health issues and will cause huge economic damage to the Delta region.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Chapter 25 (Public Health) of the Final EIR/EIS for information on public health impacts and mitigation for these impacts and Chapter 16 for information on economic impacts on the Delta and mitigation for these impacts.
4015	1	I live on the Delta. I want it to stay as it is so my grandchildren can enjoy it as much as I do.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. For more information regarding Delta as a Place please see Master Response 24.
4016	1	Protect the waterways.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4017	1	This drought has shown us that there is not enough infrastructure to support the current population let alone keep the Delta healthy. We don't need tunnels or trains. Who gets the water? North or South?	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place), and Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports).
4018	1	This plan will devastate the natural order of the Delta. Period!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4019	1	We are California natives and are so concerned with what will happen to this great area of our. We live and love the Delta for so many reasons. Our family are boaters and fishermen that also enjoy all the produce that this area provides. We are terrified that the government is going to destroy all of this with the tunnels. It just doesn't make	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. See Chapter 15 for impacts to recreation in the Delta, and mitigation for these impacts and Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, Impact AG-1 and Impact AG-2 and their mitigation to mediate important farmland in

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		sense to us, where will our grapes, tomatoes, pears, asparagus and so much more come from? We'll need to import all of this from somewhere else, this is such a fertile valley. Please don't take all this away from us.	the Delta. Also refer to Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place).
4020	1	I don't want the Delta ruined!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4021	1	I'm signing this because it does nothing to solve California water problems; the massive amount of money (look at the Bay Bridge overage) could be spent on recycling, building back ground water, tackling old allotment laws that form the foundation of this mess, and so on. The water that "flows out to sea" needs to do that or the environment will be devastated. The Delta is so vulnerable.	Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 26 for information on water rights and changes in Delta exports.
4022	1	I'm signing because Jerry Brown is lying to the California public. Calling this a " Water Fix" for California when it is nothing more than a very expensive way to send the Delta's freshest water to his large contributors.	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.
4023	1	I want to save the Delta, not destroy it.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4024	1	I have lived on the Delta for over 20 years. We boat, fish, live on the water. The Delta tunnels and associated proposals would turn numerous water communities into mud holes, property values would plummet. We have three highly accredited schools now in Discovery Bay which would be adversely affected by a declining population. Destroying a large, growing community to profit a few individuals is not acceptable.	Please refer to Master Response 44 regarding changes in Delta exports. The proposed project would not turn the Delta into mud holes. Operations of Alternative 4 and the new preferred alternative, 4A, are not expected to result in a substantial decrease or increase in Delta surface water levels. Please refer to Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Modeling Results, EIR/EIS, for more information.
4025	1	After reading about the project and its effect on the Delta eco-system and the cost involved I do not believe it is in the best interests of the people of California to proceed without further public input and a vote!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Chapter 32 of the Final EIR/EIS and Master Response 40 for information regarding outreach conducted for California WaterFix (and previously the BDCP). More information on how DWR has developed the project in an open and transparent manner is provided in Master Response 41.
4026	1	I support the plan proposed by Solagra: Solar powered desalination in the west Delta.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
4027	1	It's a waste of money in comparison to other measures (ie. desalination plants).	For more information regarding cost of the proposed project please see Master Response 5. For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
4028	1	Southern California needs to invest in converting salt water to drinking and lawn watering supply.	Please refer to Master Response 7 for information on why desalination was not included in the proposed project.
4029	1	I want to stop the water grab and save the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports).
4030	1	As humans of earth, it is our responsibility to be stewards of the land we so dearly rely on. The construction of the Delta tunnel for water consumption is a selfish act of ignorance.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4031	1	The tunnels are not a fix, they will destroy ecosystems for generations to come. Stop the madness.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4032	1	I don't think it right to steal water from the Sacramento area to give it to the south. Seems like a bad idea.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Refer to Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply)
4033	1	This government has taken enough from the people. Leave our water alone.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4034	1	I'm sick of policy that solves one problem while creating another, often bigger, problem.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4035	1	This destroys the Delta-duh!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4036	1	Keep our water. I love to fish the Delta and support the local community.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4037	1	I'm signing because it will ruin ecosystems and human health. Stop this project!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Chapter 25 (Public Health) of the Final EIR/EIS for information on public health impacts and mitigation for these impacts.
4038	1	We should not be supplying water to nut farmers when we are inn a drought! All of us need to conserve and now were going to ship what we do have instead of conserving for the people.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environment impacts in the EIR/S were raised.
4039	1	Because I also lived in Colorado and Southern California is already taking water from them and now want more. This needs to stop. We are ruining and killing our own planet.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
4040	1	I'm signing because I don't want to see the Delta destroyed	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4041	1	Take the water after the Delta when it gets to the Bay Area naturally. Tunnels are un-necessary.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. 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. Also refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
4042	1	Stop these tunnels because it will suck water from the Delta to Southern California and cause salt coming into the Delta and destroy the balance of nature. Lack of fresh water will have negative effect on 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/EIS.
4042	2	I do not know how you can claim eminent domain for the benefit of exports.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4043	1	The Delta is a very special place that can not be replaced once destroyed.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4044	1	I'm signing because it is ludicrous to pump the Delta dry, to impact not only the environment and the wildlife, but to take the water for agribusiness who does little to save water, is just not right. We need to save the Delta, not decimate it.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. It is not the result of "favoring" large corporations (e.g., large agribusinesses). In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Change in Delta Exports), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
4045	1	I oppose this disastrous project as it affects the vast wildlife and the eventual destruction of our precious resource.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4046	1	I love animals and the environment and feel we should explore other options before doing something that could have more of a negative effect on our environment.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			operational flexibility.
4047	1	The Tunnels plan would be devastating to the ecology and economy.	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. See Chapter 16 of the Final EIR/EIS for impacts to socioeconomics and mitigation for these impacts.
4048	1	The tunnels would destroy the beautiful Sacramento Delta. Stop the waste of money. Follow the slimy water wasters who are pushing this stupid plan. Push back on any plan that does not create any more water from new dams!	Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives Development) as to why the construction of dams was not included in the project and 61 (Tunnel Option) for why the tunnel option was the only alternative optimized.
4050	1	I also own a home in Discovery Bay and am aware of the negative impact the tunnels would have. I am also aware that much of the water that is to be diverted is supposedly going to almond farmers in middle California. Research shows that it takes 1 gallon of water to grow 1 almond. Moreover, the environmental impact of removing fresh water from the Delta and allowing salt water intrusion would be unacceptable. Why doesn't California build desalinization plants instead of this tunnel project and the high speed train that no one cares about.	<p>For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 63.</p> <p>Salinity in the Delta is a function of the amount and timing of freshwater input from the major tributaries, tidal action from San Francisco Bay, and exports from the Delta. During the late winter and spring months of seasonally elevated flows, and in wet years, seawater intrusion is limited and the Delta has mostly low salinity. During low-flow summer and fall months, and during dry years, lower freshwater flows result in greater amounts of seawater intrusion. Staff from DWR and USBR constantly monitor Delta water quality conditions and adjust operations of the SWP and CVP in real time as necessary to meet water quality objectives set by the State Water Resource Control Board protection of agricultural water supply, municipal and industrial drinking water supply, and fish and wildlife beneficial uses. See section 4.3.4 for a discussion on the proposed projects effects on water quality, salinity and electrical conductivity.</p> <p>Effects of the alternatives on salinity levels are described in Chapter 8, Water Quality, and Appendix 8H, Electrical Conductivity, EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Modeling results indicate that the implementation of the water conveyance facilities may positively or adversely affect in-Delta water quality, depending on a number of factors including location, time of year, and hydrologic conditions. See tables in 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>
4051	1	Stop the "Peripheral Canal"! This endangers Northern California ecosystems dependent on existing water supplies. We don't need more water greedy trees. Farmers need to adapt to the changing climate and plant accordingly	<p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures,</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.
4052	1	It is imperative we protect our environment from industrial eco-rapists.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4053	1	Damaging regional ecologies to avoid systemic water conservation measures is an unsustainable and unacceptable strategy!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environment impacts in the EIR/S were raised.
4054	1	The project is not ecologically nor economically sound. The diversion of critical water from a magnificent ecosystem to grow water intensive crops that are exported does not make any sense at all. Please consider what is best for our environment and local economy. Submitted respectfully.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water) and Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place).
4055	1	Financial gains need to stop taking precedent over environmental and public health concerns.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. For more information regarding impacts to public health please see Chapter 25 of the FEIR/EIS.
4056	1	This is only a band-aid approach, and will do more damage to our environment in the future. This fast fix is no fix. I say no way!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4057	1	Obviously against! Save the Delta, reduce salt water intrusion!	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.
4058	1	Just another way for humans to destroy the habitats of the rest of the inhabitants of earth.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4059	1	Instead of tunnels, there should be permanent barriers at the Benicia Bridge. These would have large gates that could be opened or closed on demand, depending on conditions and during emergencies. This solves all of the current and foreseen problems	By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria 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 for more information on the purpose

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		and totally eliminate the need for the Peripheral Tunnels and/or canals.	<p>and need for the proposed project.</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 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>Master Response 36 explains how the BDCP or the California WaterFix Project is different from the previously proposed Peripheral Canal.</p>
4060	1	The tunnels are not the answer and a huge waste of money. We voted it down 35 years ago - why are we doing it again? Spend the money on desalination plants!	For more information regarding cost of the proposed project please see Master Response 5. For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
4061	1	I'm signing because I live in the East Bay. 20 minutes from the Delta. Los Angeles is a water sucking community, and they will learn nothing about conserving if they can steal water from Northern California everytime they run low (I was born in Southern California, by the way). Farming is a way of life for many in Central California and water is best used there and in the north to prevent us from drying up like Los Angeles!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Please refer to Master Response 44 (Changes in Delta Exports), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
4062	1	This anti-environment project is a dreadful example of abuse of power.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4063	1	I hope with all my heart that our Governor is able to act more responsibly regarding the interest of the Californian residents. Signing for the Tunnel means turning back to the old short term and resources wasting habits which created this disastrous water situation. It would be on time to act visionary, like we, the Californian residents, expect from our Governor!	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.
4064	1	Federal and State elected officials have been bought by corporate farm interests who consume 80% of water. It will destroy the Delta and family farms by condemning properties for tunnel right of way. The tunnels do not create more water -- just accelerate the draining of the resource.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Therefore, this project is not the result of "favoring" large corporations (e.g., large agribusinesses). In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 26 (Changes In Delta Exports). See Chapter 16 of the Final EIR/EIS for socioeconomic impacts of the proposed project and mitigation for these impacts.
4065	1	Our bays and waterways are crucial for maintaining habitat and buffers for the coastal areas.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4066	1	I have a home on the Sacramento Delta and I know what these tunnels would do to our precious land- destroy it!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4067	1	The proposed tunnel project will not provide any additional water for our ever expanding population. I feel we should invest our time,energy and money in identifying new sources of water. Storm water reclamation and large scale recycling come to mind.	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 refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.
4068	1	I'm signing because the Delta is very important to me personally, and to our environment.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4069	1	This is the most egregious, stupid, small-minded action ever attempted by this state's Turd Polishers - don't bet your lives!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4070	1	I'm signing because I want to save the fish!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such 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).
4071	1	If operated within salinity ground rules, the tunnels provide no additional water to the State. UOP economist Dr. Michael has shown that the costs exceed the benefits.	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.
4071	2	No levee failures have been caused by an earthquake, not even a magnitude 7.0 simulated by UC Los Angeles.	As described in Section 9.1.1.3.1. Delta in Chapter 9, the Delta region has experienced low-level seismic shaking from nearby and regional faults since 1800, with no earthquakes greater than magnitude 5.0. However, because the period since 1800 is relatively short on a geological time scale, projections must be made of the probability of ground shaking occurring in the future. As described in Chapter 9 and in Section 3E.2.4.2 Ground Acceleration (Ground Shaking) in Appendix 3E, the Delta is subject to moderate to strong ground shaking from seismic sources from both within and outside the Delta., with a peak ground acceleration of up to 0.46g, based on a return interval of 475 years. Hence, a low level of seismic shaking in geologically recent history is not a reliable indicator of future shaking hazard.
4071	3	Let's get real and start installing desalination.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
4072	1	Do not agree with Jerry Brown's idea and plan.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4073	1	The state should be using the funds toward desalinization rather than building tunnels and pumps.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
4074	1	I am signing because we live on water and it is recreational for us. These tunnels will bring in more salt water which we do not want. Salt water brings in mammals we do not want. It will affect fishing, skiing and all recreational sports. Please reconsider your	The preferred alternative, Alternative 4A, would not contain significant impacts for electrical conductivity (EC) related to objective exceedance in the Sacramento River at Emmaton, would not contain substantial degradation in the western Delta due to increased chloride concentrations, and would have less water

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		actions.	quality effects in the western Delta related to EC and fewer exceedances of the fish and wildlife EC objective between Prisoners Point and Jersey Point. After introduction of mitigation measures, Alternative 4A, would result in less than significant impacts for EC and chloride. Please also refer to Chapter 8, Water Quality, regarding salinity or electrical conductivity impacts near Antioch, and Master Response 14 regarding salinity. Therefore, the preferred alternative, 4A, would be anticipated to result in less than significant effects on fish and water quality related to salinity, which would result in less than significant effects on fishing from a recreation perspective.
4075	1	Water is a limited resource. Any attempt to divert this particular supply would have devastating effects on the economy and ecology of more than the San Francisco Delta area. We told you 33 years ago that we didn't want it. Please don't bring it up again.	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. The proposed project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 36 (Peripheral Canal), and Master Response 34 (Delta as a Place). See Chapter 16 of the Final EIR/EIS for socioeconomic impacts of the proposed project and mitigation for these impacts.
4076	1	We are shocked that the Delta is being treated so poorly. The fish are almost gone, and now the boating and fishing will go the same way. We retired out here from the Bay Area 18 years ago and our property will be worthless and we won't be able to afford to move elsewhere. We used to vote for Governor Brown! So sorry we did now! No tunnels!	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project, including discussions of reverse flows and endangered fish species.</p> <p>For more information regarding impacts to recreation and its associated mitigation measures please see Chapter 15 of the FEIR/EIS.</p>
4077	1	I do not support California agriculture that is as water intensive as almonds and pistachios, especially when they are being grown in an inappropriate area.	State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via proposed conveyance facilities.
4078	1	Obviously a destructive bad idea for all 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. 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.
4079	1	I can't believe that anyone can say that removing more of the Delta's water will somehow improve the Delta. I know that farmers need water to produce our food but not at the expense of destroying the source of our water to drink, to continue to support our fisheries and all the jobs this fisheries support.	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. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
4079	2	I and my son and grand daughters spend many hours fishing in the Delta for stripers, sturgeon and salmon and would like to continue.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities” would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: “Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities” would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.
4080	1	We need to save our backyards which is the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4081	1	I'm opposed because of the corporate ag business water grab for profits of exported produce. If you think this will satisfy their thirst, think again. Look at the devastating effects they've cause by over pumping from the water tables. As the ground settles, so goes our water bank and when that runs dry, they'll be looking for more from the Delta. We've seen it before, over pumping water from the Delta caused the salmon population to collapse in 2005-07. Stop the tunnels and the corporate ag business from destroying our livelihood.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Therefore, this project is not the result of "favoring" large corporations (e.g., large agribusinesses). In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 26 (Change in Delta Exports), Master Response 5 (Conservation Measure 1 as a CM) and Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
4082	1	Work smarter, not harder to formulate a viable solution to our water crisis, except it's not a crisis, it's actually California normal! We can do better and once a wild place is destroyed, there's no getting it back.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. 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. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 4 (Alternatives).
4083	1	Don't give away our water!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4084	1	Water is our core, primary resource. Earth, trees, food as well as people die quickly without it, and die forever. Big Ag does not use it wisely, safely and should not be able to destroy the majority of our water. Small farms may be our best idea, with wise use of water (permaculture, etc.)	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
4085	1	I am signing because I am a fisherman, love animals and the Delta and would hate to see anymore water pumped out of the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4086	1	It's a bit confusing to me that Governor Brown would effect the environment so adversely. When you have a huge water supply to the west of San Francisco. All Governor Brown needs to do is contact the Department of the Navy; they have been conducting the art desalination for years.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
4087	1	I'm signing because these tunnels would change the fluid dynamics of the Delta and make it less healthy and leave less fresh water to hold back the salt water from the San Francisco Bay.	For information on how the project could affect in-Delta flows, please see Chapter 6 Surface Water. For information on how the project could affect salinity, please see Chapter 8 Water Quality.
4088	1	Water is everyone's issue. With all the droughts we need to protect water.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4089	1	It is unnecessary and dangerous for wildlife.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4090	1	I grew up in Sacramento. I cannot imagine California without the Delta. We must protect not destroy wildlife! Please don't do this! Act responsibly.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS for impacts on terrestrial resources and mitigation for these impacts.
4091	1	I swear I think Governor Brown is mentally ill. He hasn't made any sense since he started his governorship. I oppose this, my family opposes this, so go find something else to do and leave the environment to people who know what they are doing.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4092	1	The new tunnels will further ruin the Delta ecosystem while doing nothing to conserve water throughout the state. It encourages poor water conservation practices.	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) and Master Response 6 (Demand Management).
4093	1	Southern California needs to be responsible for its own waters. I was there in May and didn't see efforts of conservation while many in Northern California and Central California have been doing their part. It also takes away from allowing fishing in our Delta. I know we are nationally known, if not more and bring business to the local areas. Please do not allow this to happen! No on the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 6 (Demand Management) and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
4094	1	The Delta tunnels are a really bad concept. The \$51 billion cost would be better spent on water storage in Southern California.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. For information regarding why water storage was not included in the proposed project, refer to Master Response 37 (Water Storage) and Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS.
4095	1	This is just the latest of the same old water grab to supply the southern part of the state. Time to think smarter and find a way that does not destroy valuable water resources as they exist now. How about less pools and smaller homes and industry requirements on water use that are actually tracked and supported?	It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project. Rather, the scope and purpose of the proposed project is much more limited. As explained in Chapter 2 Project Objectives and Purpose and Need of the Final

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>EIR/EIS, the fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the State Water Project (SWP) system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and Central Valley Project (CVP) south-of-Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework with statutory and contractual obligations.</p> <p>The proposed project does not make determinations regarding how water delivered through the proposed project conveyance, California Aqueduct, Delta Mendota Canal, or other water conveyance facility will be put to a beneficial use. The proposed project would be operated as a component of the State Water Project (SWP) and would be used to help convey SWP, CVP, and transfer water to contracted water users. As indicated in the FEIR/FEIS, the operation of the new conveyance facilities includes diverting water through the new north delta diversion facilities or through the existing south delta water diversion facilities. It is outside the scope of the proposed project (and in fact, outside the purview of the lead agencies) to make determinations regarding what constitutes a beneficial use or modify stipulations in water service contracts between the DWR and the SWP contractors, Reclamation and their contractors, and between water transfer sellers and buyers. For more information regarding the beneficial uses of water please see Master Response 34.</p>
4096	1	This project would cause unacceptable impacts on the San Francisco Bay-Delta region. It would induce continued, excessive population growth in Southern California as well as facilitate ongoing agricultural impacts on the western side of the San Joaquin Valley where such agriculture is inappropriate and unsustainable.	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. The Lead Agencies do not have local land use planning authority or control or local zoning practices. Refer to Master Response 26 (Beneficial Use of Water).
4097	1	More dams should be built instead of draining the Delta and destroying a fragile ecosystem like the Delta. How many times has Governor "Brown-nose" Brown gone fishing or hunting? That is the problem with politicians. They could care less about your views.	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 37 (Storage).
4098	1	The negatives outweigh the positives in this situation. We need to preserve the San Francisco Bay-Delta.	Since the late 1800s, the Bay-Delta ecosystem has been substantially altered. Changes in key environmental attributes of the Bay-Delta have contributed to the current degraded state of the ecosystem and appear to be proximate causes of declines in desired fishes and increases in non-native species. California Waterfix is not intended to address all the factors that have contributed to the Delta's decline and briefly summarizes a few but not all of those factors. Many factors that have contributed to the decline of the Delta's ecosystem including the conversion of tidal marsh and floodplains to farmland, construction of levees and altering of tide flows, in-Delta and upstream water diversions, contaminant discharges, ammonia and nutrient 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.
4099	1	I am so disappointed in the politics that they would take more fresh water from the Delta and send it south. The Delta is a major part of my life and I can't believe this is for the better good of the state. Yes, more voters want it because they live south, but it will increase the salinity of the Delta. My lawn is gone, we have dryscape landscaping. I don't want a salty Delta.	<p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations.</p> <p>By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>projects under a fully-implemented California WaterFix project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years.</p> <p>Regulatory water quality objectives (or guidance values) exist for these constituents for protection of agricultural water supply, municipal and industrial drinking water supply, and fish and wildlife beneficial uses. 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>Please also refer to Master Response 31 (Delta Reform Act), Master Response 14 (Salinity), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Uses), Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports), Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), and Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place).</p>
4100	1	You will be killing the wetlands.	<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>
4101	1	In case you don't know: these tunnels will have the capacity to completely remove all the water from the Sacramento River.	Under the stringent environmental statutes in place today, including the Endangered Species Act, operation of the proposed water delivery system could not drain the Delta rivers and channels dry, including the Sacramento River. The proposed project's facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants, would be operated in accordance with permits issued by, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the State Water Resources Control Board, among other agencies. The proposed project would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards.
4102	1	The tunnels will kill the Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4103	1	I'm so tired of politicians forcing their agendas on the people of California for personal gain!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4104	1	I want my voice and the voice of California voters to be heard and listened to. Northern California is doing everything possible to conserve water and save the Delta and the middle of the state is sinking two inches a month due to mismanagement and the permanent destruction of the fragile aquifers. Please hear our pleas and stop the tunnels, save the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 6 (Demand Management).
4105	1	Keep our Delta and fisheries intact.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4106	1	Save local farms and fish.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4107	1	We need the Delta water for the wildlife and environment of the Delta region.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4108	1	We need to stop destroying our ecosystem for temporary fixes - it just passes the problem on to the future while giving little incentive to finding a path to long term sustainability.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4109	4	Governor Brown, please stop wrecking the environment. This is not a good long-term solution.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4110	1	It will destroy the precious wildlife.	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).
4111	1	Tunnels are an economic and ecological disaster! Let Southern California plan to get their own water. There is plenty of government land along the shore at Camp Pendleton.	Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
4112	1	This is an outrage and a travesty! This is being crammed down the throats of Californians, at huge cost and to the unrepairable detriment of the Sacramento Delta and the San Francisco Bay. Stop it, Governor Brown! We don't want this project!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
4113	1	The tunnels will ruin the Delta and wildlife.	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.
4114	1	I oppose exporting more water. The Delta should be restored to promote wildlife and reduce salinity. Central Valley farms need to practice efficient farming methods. I have seen midday, overhead sprinklers in orange groves. This is a tragic waste of a resource the fish and the San Francisco Bay need.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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>Refer to Master Response 6 (Demand Management) as well as Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p>
4115	1	The "WaterFix" is a corrupt, undemocratic means of helping cronies in the south and ignoring the real water needs of this 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. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
4116	1	This tunnel project is an environmental nightmare.	<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>
4117	1	Stop the destruction of the environment! Greed is vile.	<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>
4118	1	I love the Delta. It should be preserved, not raped of all its nature. Don't do the tunnels, please.	<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>
4119	1	This is a short-sighted project that only serves a few narrow interests and parties. It does not serve the public nor the fragile environment. It is wrong on every level; it ignores science, current best practices for sustainability, and the fact that taxpayers will be harmed, not helped, by this water diversion plan. Benefits will go only to big agribusiness, who already receive water diversions, in order to protect their profits.	<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. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Therefore, this project is not the result of "favoring" large corporations (e.g., large agribusinesses). In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), and Master Response 5 (Funding).
4120	1	Our Delta is a fragile ecosystem and the tunnels will not only impact that system, they will fuel the demand to Southern California for our precious resources.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
4121	1	I am an avid user of the Delta and see already the damage caused by sending water to Southern California.	DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented California WaterFix project would be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Please see Master Response 26 for additional information on effects on Northern California.
4122	1	I'm sick of Governor Brown's destructive and wasteful policies. Enough is enough!	Please note that the project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole.
4123	1	The California Delta is a precious resource that should not be forsaken by the Governor to support corporate agriculture for further development. A comprehensive plan needs to be adopted that focuses more on the health of the estuary and less on conveyance south. We need to be sending out surplus water to the Tulare Lake Basin, so farmers in the south will have access to the water when they need it - not just when it flows.	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. 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 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).
4124	1	Benicia salinity gates is millions not billions, take months not 15 years to implement and the salinity gate is a thousand times more environmentally friendly while supplying California with trillions of gallons more water to be kept in existing reservoirs.	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 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.
4125	1	In my view the mega tunnels are far from any creative thinking on the part of our elected officials. The anticipated capital for the project I believe would be better utilized on California's aging infrastructure.	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.
4126	1	Thousands of acres of prime farmlands as well as wildlife and fish habitat will be destroyed. The California WaterFix tunnel plan is a mass homicide of the Delta. Once	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
		dead, it cannot be brought back.	<p>and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations.</p> <p>By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
4127	1	I do not want to see the Delta destroyed by this way too costly plan!	<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>
4128	1	The tunnels produce no more water, are useless in drought and in heavy rain years which equals only four out of ten years that it works. Desalination works any time and any place you need it and costs less than the tunnels that can destroy the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, of the EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. Please also refer to the following: Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 4 (Alternatives Development), Master Response 6 (Desalination/ Demand Management), Master Response 7 (Desalination), and Master Response 37 (Storage). Although components such as desalination plants 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.
4129	1	I think family farms are worth saving, and there are many, many farm families in the Delta that depend on the water that is here.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
4130	1	I do not believe that the tunnels are the right thing. They won't protect the Delta and because the cost of the project is totally unnecessary.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding).
4131	1	I understand Southern California's need for more water, my son lives there. But once the fish and other affected species are gone, they are gone. We need government to look at a different approach.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives.
4132	1	Desalinate for extra fresh water instead.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
4133	1	Delta farmer and resident and I hate anything to do with this water grab or any of Jerry Brown's politics. Don't plant your crops in a glorified desert, California.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4134	1	This is the wrong approach to the water woes of the region.	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>more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>The project would help to address the resilience and adaptability of the Delta to climate change through water delivery facilities combined with a range of operational In addition to the added water management flexibility created by new water diversions and operational scenarios, the project would improve habitat, increase food supplies and reduce the effects of other stressors on the Delta ecosystem.</p>
4135	1	I do not want to see any destruction of the Delta that this tunnel(s) will do. The fish and ecosystem are dying because of the current water diversion which must be stopped.	<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>
4136	1	The California Delta is an amazing place! It supports fish and other wildlife. An evaluation of priorities needs to take place! Focus on the environment and stop the nonsense of the tunnels!	<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>
4137	1	I live in the Bay Area. Diverting water away from the Delta will only send Northern California's precious water south to an arid Southern California, ruining the Bay in the process. Governor Brown wants a legacy project? This will give him one. The destruction of one of nature's most delicately balanced ecosystems.	<p>Please note that the project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole. The project would help to address the resilience and adaptability of the Delta to climate change through water delivery facilities combined with a range of operational In addition to the added water management flexibility created by new water diversions and operational scenarios, the project would improve habitat, increase food supplies and reduce the effects of other stressors on the Delta ecosystem. Please also refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports/Area of Origin/Water Rights) and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>
4138	1	It is outrageous that the Brown Administration is insisting this is a good idea. It is a disaster in slow motion and will ensure continued species losses and Delta habitat degradation. The sound we hear is the sound of our coveted Northern California environmental issues being flushed down the toilet to ensure green golf course in Southern California with the usual odd suspects making deceitful boatloads of cash. This is a sick joke and must be opposed by all right-thinking sentiments. I hope this achieves zero.	<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. 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 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>
4139	1	I'm signing this petition because there are better ways to keep our water in California.	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
4140	1	For one: this is not the solution! This has many backlashes that people may not see. The fish, the farms, the land, everything! Everything is as it is because that is how nature wants it. We need to be innovative here. This is not innovation. This is trying to do	<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. 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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		something that is already being done and not working in other places.	meetings and stakeholder briefings. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
4141	1	It is insane to think that the taking of the natural water flows through the historically delicate Delta could in any way be a good idea. The ecology of the entire region depends on these flows. The current quantities of water already taken south via the canal are all that can be safely allocated. Not more!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years.
4142	1	I do not believe this is good for the environment.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4143	1	The available projects to enhance water supply that would not remove more water from the Delta. And also supply local jobs.	<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> <p>In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Deliveries to in-Delta senior water rights users are the same under the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and all action alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS in accordance with existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high.</p> <p>Changes in employment under the proposed project and other action alternatives as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative are presented in Chapter 16 of the EIR/EIS.</p>
4144	1	Mr. Brown, you know this is wrong. Please stop abusing your power and do something good for the people of this state.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4145	1	I am a resident of Southern California, and even though we are experiencing a drought, we should not just take water from somewhere, we can find a better solution.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Refer to Master Response 3 for information on the purpose and need for the project.
4146	1	To stop the tunnels from ruining our lakes.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4147	1	More dams need to be built. Not tunnels or High (not) Speed Rail.	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project. Rather, the scope and purpose of the proposed project is much more limited. As explained in Chapter 2 Project Objectives and Purpose and Need of the Final EIR/EIS, the fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the State Water Project (SWP) system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and Central Valley Project (CVP) south-of-Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework with statutory and contractual obligations.</p> <p>Additional water storage was eliminated from consideration in the Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS through the alternatives development and screening process (discussed in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives). As such, the proposed project does not propose storage as a project component. Although the proposed project would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, Alternative 4A is a stand-alone project which demonstrates independent utility just as future storage projects would demonstrate. Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives) and 56 (Storage) for additional information.</p>
4148	1	There are only two estuaries left. We have to protect it!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4149	1	This is 'welfare for the rich' program using tax money to build infrastructure, and diverting water that is needed downstream from the intake point for benefit of a few For-Profit Agri-businesses.	<p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>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>
4150	1	I am signing because I oppose the project and the damage to the Delta it would cause.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4151	1	I live in the Delta and have researched the inland deltas of which there are only 2 in the world! The other is not in North America. so I cannot believe that anyone would do anything to jeopardize a natural wonder like this.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4152	1	I am against the inconsiderable action that the Governor is planning to do. This idea may be beneficial to the residents of the Governor but what about the people of which he plans to take such a valuable resource from!? The fact that there's a danger to the environment we are trying to preserve is why I sign this and want to help people realize that this is more dangerous than it seems.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
4153	1	To maintain the health of the Delta waterway.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4154	1	I oppose the tunnels and believe they will do irreparable damage to the ecosystem in the California Delta.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4155	1	This tunnel plan needs to stop because it will be devastating to the Bay-Delta estuary.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4156	1	We need the water here I believe Southern California can be creative and get water there.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Refer to Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
4157	1	I'm signing because I believe that the San Francisco Bay-Delta's ecosystem is more important than big ag profits!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
4158	1	The Delta tunnels will not benefit the Delta it will only benefit Governor Brown and his agenda. The whole project is a waste of time, money, and a precious ecosystem we can't afford to lose.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 and Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding).
4159	1	The Delta is already in trouble. Bad idea.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
4160	1	Do not make these kind of short-sighted and disruptive policy decisions. As Americans, we must be more gentle and respectful of our environment, or we will ruin it forever.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. 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.
4161	1	Please do not destroy our Delta--it is vital to the health of San Francisco Bay and California	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4162	1	I am signing because the tunnels will ruin the Delta and San Francisco Bay. There are other solutions such as water storage at Tulare Lake with existing infrastructure. If there is no rain why put in tunnels and take more water from the Delta destroying farmer land that is fertile not to the farmers in a desert.	It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 (Demand Management) for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project. Rather, the scope and purpose of the proposed project is much more limited. As explained in Chapter 2 Project Objectives and Purpose and Need of the Final EIR/EIS, the fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>physical and operational improvements to the State Water Project (SWP) system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and Central Valley Project (CVP) south-of-Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework with statutory and contractual obligations. Please see Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p> <p>Additional water storage was eliminated from consideration in the Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS through the alternatives development and screening process (discussed in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives). As such, the proposed project does not propose storage as a project component. Although the proposed project would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, Alternative 4A is a stand-alone project which demonstrates independent utility just as future storage projects would demonstrate. Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives) and 56 (Storage) for additional information.</p> <p>The plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Although the project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented California Waterfix project would be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports) for further information.</p> <p>For information regarding the beneficial uses of water please see Master Response 34.</p> <p>Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place) addresses the cumulative impacts from the proposed project.</p>
4163	1	These proposed tunnels will destroy the Delta system.	<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>Please refer to Master Response 4 (Tunnel Option), which addresses why the tunnel option was the only alternative optimized.</p>
4164	1	I value the lives of all the beings who are not human for whom the Delta waterways are home.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>
4165	1	I love the San Francisco Bay as is. Please do not compromise the ecology of the Bay. Healthy fish and migrating waterfowl are more important to me than supporting almond and pistachio farms. Instead invest in urban and rural projects that could enhance water sustainability. Leave the bay and nature alone!	<p>It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <p>It is also important to note that providing regulatory oversight to agribusinesses is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. The Lead Agencies do not have land use planning authorities (such as changing local land uses and zoning ordinances or controlling what crops should be planted).</p> <p>For information regarding the beneficial uses of water please see Master Response 34.</p>
4166	1	Do not ruin my Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4168	1	The Tunnels would be devastating to the ecology and economy of San Francisco Bay-Delta region.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), and Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).
4169	1	You are going to use taxpayer dollars to destroy the ecosystem, irrigate the desert, and keep Palm Springs golf courses green. Are you out of your damned minds?! Why do not you all buy the stolen water from Nestle and PepsiCo by the bottle?	The commenter does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.
4170	1	I understand that Governor Brown wants to protect all of California's water needs but we need the water that our Delta provides our farmers, wells and aquifers to be sure that we can sustain our crops and the jobs that are needed to get them to market. I hate to use the term dog eat dog but that's what it comes down to, Mr. Governor. I say a hardy and resounding "no" to the pipeline and I truly believe my friends and neighbors alike will agree with me.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4171	1	I believe this is the right thing to do. We cannot allow the tunnel project to happen. We have to protect the survival of the Delta.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4172	1	I love the Delta; I fish every weekend and enjoy the freedom it gives me. The beauty of the Delta is incredible. Please do not take this away from me.	The proposed project would not take the Delta away from recreationists. On-water and on-land recreation would still be able to take place throughout the Delta.
4173	1	The tunnels will ruin our marine life!	The commenter does not offer any evidence on how the project would result in significant aquatic resource impacts related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4174	1	The Delta belongs to the people, not the corporations or the Governor. We need to save the Delta not kill it.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4175	1	I am signing because with the tunnels you will ruin the Delta and all that it offers to the waterfowl and fishing industry. Stop stripping the Delta of our recreational arena and	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		the nearby farming lands and allowing the salinity to invade our fresh water.	standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Chapter 15 of the Final EIR/EIS for information on project impacts to recreation and mitigation for the impacts. See Master Response 3 (Project and Need) and Master Response 14 (Salinity).
4176	1	I oppose the tunnel project for all the right reasons, too much money, no gain for water, many issues with the environment, etc.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding).
4177	1	Taking water from the Delta has been a bad move in past history and more water taken will be the end of the Delta as we know it. Tell old man Brown to get some morals and quit trying to destroy 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 proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years.
4178	1	This is not needed. It will ruin the eco-system of the Delta. Use the money to build desalinization plants instead.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
4179	1	This isn't a fix and will cause more damage to our farmlands and eco-system.	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 18 (Agricultural Mitigation).
4180	1	It is well past time for all of California to address our water issues - where are the needed reservoirs in Southern California that would save the water they get? Where are their restrictions to water waste? Where are their appropriate landscape and watering plans? Where are their solutions to live within what is essentially a desert environment? Every Californian needs to be on board - north and south - ready to do now what will provide permanent solutions for living wisely within the local environment. If you live in a desert environment, find solutions that work in your own space without creating desert where none exists now.	For information regarding why water storage was not included in the proposed project, refer to Master Response 37 (Water Storage) and Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management and Master Response 35 regarding southern California's water supply.
4181	1	We need the water too.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4182	1	I am signing this petition because its time to say no to big ag and political interests. Their "riches" mean nothing. This tunnel will destroy an ecosystem, and like a string of dominoes many other systems will fail.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the Clean Water Act and federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4183	1	We remember the Peripheral Canal and this is no different unless it's a worse idea than	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project and 52 regarding

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		before. Until development is significantly slowed in California, don't ask us to foot the bill for massive projects or conserve more than the 60% of water use our family has saved. Citizens here voted decades ago to build a world-class water system and have taxed ourselves for decades to pay for it. But new developments get the same water without strict conservation requirements and without the investment in water the rest of us paid for. Enough already!	comparisons to the Peripheral Canal. For more information regarding funding sources please see Master Response 5.
4184	1	We need to keep our water here for needs, like fires and drinking.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4185	1	I live in the Delta and Antioch and the surrounding area not only depends on it for drinking water but local and Central California farmers need the water to grow the food that we all eat.	Considerations of adverse impacts to Delta water users due to implementation of the action alternatives (not climate change, sea level rise, or projected population growth that would have occurred with or without the proposed project) are discussed in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, and Chapter 20, Public Services and Utilities. Changes in Delta water quality that could affect Delta water users are discussed in Chapter 8, Water Quality, including changes in bromide, chloride, and electrical conductivity.
4186	1	I have lived in Antioch for thirty years. The Delta is a part of the history of the towns along the water ways. Creates a sustainable habitat for all types of animals, fish, waterfowl as well as others. We have done enough damage to these wildlife sanctuaries.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4187	1	The tunnels will destroy valuable salmon habitat and wreak havoc on California and Oregon's commercial fisheries.	For information about effects of the preferred alternative, Alternative 4A, on salmonids, 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.
4188	1	I strongly oppose the tunnels and the environmental devastation it will cause to the Delta ecosystem, and salmon runs. My family depends on the salmon. I am a commercial fisherman as well as a charter boat captain. I think it is a crime to build these tunnels to supply water to farm in the desert. There is no price you can put on the environment and it should never be sold out. This is a bad idea all around and wrong in so many different ways !	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), and Master Response 5 (Conservation Measure 1 as a CM). Chapter 11 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect fish. It describes the impacts, both negative and positive, and discusses measures that would be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts and to compensate for significant impacts.
4189	1	Environmental awareness and conservation are what I believe in.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4190	1	The Delta is my home and this will be devastating, all for Jerry Brown's fat-cat lobbyists in Big Ag down in Central California and Southern California! Where the hell are all the protesters now?!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4191	1	I live on the Delta and I want to prevent the Delta ecosystem from being destroyed.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4192	1	Southern California doesn't need our water and the tunnels will ruin the local eco-systems.	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4193	1	Those tunnels would ruin the Delta.	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. 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.
4194	1	This will destroy the Delta and local communities, hurt native species - and for what? So a few people can make a lot of money growing almond trees.	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).
4195	1	The Delta has been farmed for over a hundred years and continues to be rich farmland. The Tunnels would take water from the richest farm land in the state/country and shipping it south, where after a few years the soil turns saline and can't grow most things.	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 and Master Response 14, Water Quality, for more details regarding effects of the alternatives on salinity levels.
4196	1	Our lives depend on the Delta and what you're planning is going to destroy our water supply, the wildlife habitat and our farm land. On top of that spend millions we can't afford.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding).
4197	1	Big waste of money.	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.
4198	1	This is a classic politically motivated boondoggle of the first magnitude. Let common sense prevail!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4199	1	This farce has gone on long enough. The Federal government through EIA reports as well state reports from Fish and Game and Wildlife departments have all reported the negative impacts these tunnels will have. Why persist in the face of overwhelming evidence that they are not economically or environmentally viable?	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding).
4200	1	I oppose the Delta Tunnels, they do not solve the water shortage issue, the money would be better spent on reclamation/recycling, rebuilding aging water delivery infrastructure, updating building codes to allow re-use if "grey" water for certain applications. Stop giving "Big Ag" business's an unfair share, uphold protections already in place for this irreplaceable resource.	Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 34 for additional details on the determination of beneficial use.
4201	1	I'm a native San Franciscan/Californian who loves the outdoors and values the health of our Bay Delta system. For years, those to the South and Central Valley farmers have been trying to find new ways to take more and more of our water. I've heard comments from a farmer saying that any water that reaches the bay is wasted water. Where is it written that land farmers have an absolute right to all the water they want. How about people who fish for a living? They are farmers of the sea/ oceans. Don't they have a right to maintain their livelihood?	As described in Chapter 5 of the EIR/EIS, the State Water Resources Control Board issues water rights to support beneficial uses of water, including fishing and ecosystem. In addition, diversion of water for municipal and agricultural uses are considered in the development of federal and state regulations, including biological opinions to protect federally-listed aquatic and wildlife species by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, federally-listed aquatic resources by National Marine Fisheries Service, and state-listed species by California Department of Fish and Wildlife. These requirements are included in the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and all of the action alternatives presented in the EIR/EIS.
4201	2	Governor Brown is proposing this project as a water fix? Is it really any different than the Peripheral Canal that was rejected in the early 80's? The only difference is we don't see the water being taken away from the Delta. Does he think he's outsmarting us with this "stealth" water grab? Enough is enough.	A number of important improvements have been made to set the current proposal apart from the Peripheral Canal. For instance, tunnels are proposed to reduce surface impacts associated with canals. The capacity of the Proposed Project is more than 10,000 cfs smaller than the Peripheral Canal. The project as proposed allows for dual conveyance allowing through-Delta operations to continue in order to maintain in-Delta water quality. The Proposed Project would require operation of the proposed new in-Delta portions of the CVP and SWP pursuant to environmentally stringent rules under the Federal Endangered Species Act and California Endangered Species Act. Refer to Master Response 36 (Peripheral Canal).
4201	3	Farmers need to find better ways to farm that doesn't use as much water. We need to stop trying to turn arid, desert land into farm land. There isn't an endless supply of water available. Sometimes it seems to me that farmers (big/corporate - not the little guy) feel that if they plant, the water will come. News flash: we never know from one year to the next how much rain/ water we will have so stop acting like we do!	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. Please refer to Master Response 34 for additional details on the determination of beneficial use.
4202	1	I am a fourth generation San Joaquin County-raised person who strongly opposes taking Sacramento River water south. I resent the amount of money to be spent by the state to bypass the Delta. The Sacramento River water should go naturally through the Delta and San Francisco Bay to assist with the spawning of our Pacific salmon that support the fisherman of my current residence, Monterey. Keep the Sacramento River water flowing through the San Francisco Bay and Delta.	As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 5.
4203	1	No good will come of this "Brown Legacy Builder!"	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4204	1	You are killing the Delta. Prime farmland, fish, plants. Desalinate. Stop the Westside farming and water thirsty crops. Tunnels just bypass the Delta so you can let salt water push into 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.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4205	1	I live on the Delta and will see first hand the impact these tunnels will have on the local environment and wildlife. Alternative solutions need to be researched and considered.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need Master Response 24 for details on the Delta as a place and the impacts of the proposed project on the Delta.
4206	1	I am against this Southern California water grab.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environment impacts in the EIR/S were raised.
4207	1	I oppose ruining SF Bay/Delta water estuary.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
4208	1	I highly oppose the tunnels. This will be devastating to many.	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.
4209	1	We need our water! This is not a freaking money game Jerry Brown! Can't wait till your [expletive deleted] is out of office! You are doing nothing but screwing so many good things up!	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.
4210	1	I was born and raised in Contra Costa County. I love the Delta and it should not be destroyed by Brown or any other political group.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4211	1	Tunnels are a bad idea and will be detrimental to the Delta. Will only benefit big money folks in Southern California.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
4212	1	This is a waste of money. It will destroy the Delta ecosystem.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4213	1	I'm worried that the Delta as we know it will be ruined.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
4214	1	No tunnels. They are bad for the Delta.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4215	1	New water sources are needed, not redistribution of water from a fragile ecosystem.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 4 (Alternatives), and Master Response 6 (Demand Management).
4216	1	The Delta and farmers matter.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4217	1	We need to stop destroying the very ecosystems that allow our species to flourish.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4218	1	We will lose the river to cities.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4219	1	Water should not be diverted for the benefit of a limited number of private interests, including Central Valley farmers.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project and 44 regarding changes to Delta exports.
4220	1	I believe that this will be end of an amazing ecosystem, which will have devastating consequences for the land, people, environment, animals and life in general.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
4221	1	Tunnels are not the solution to California water issues caused by over draft dewatering, wasteful use, lack enforcement to landscape ordinances and increased population. No tunnels.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, along with Master Response 6 describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not part of the proposed action, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. The commenter is also referred to Master Responses: Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water). The proposed project is one component, among many, of the California Water Action Plan. 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.
4222	1	We need the water in Northern California. Shipping water to Los Angeles is not the answer.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Refer to Master Response 34 (Beneficial use of water) and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
4223	1	The Delta is the linchpin in Northern California's ecosystem. Take too much water from it, and we will destroy agriculture, fisheries and bird populations.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
4224	1	The tunnels will directly affect my family. We have grown up on the Delta and I now am raising my kids doing the same. This will affect so many small businesses along the Delta.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. Impacts to regional economics are discussed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, under Alternative 4A, Impact ECON-1.
4225	1	The tunnel will disrupt the delicate balance of our Delta. Do not make a mistake that cannot be repaired.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4226	1	These tunnels are a horrible idea. Our farmers cannot grow crops with salt water, and that is what the Delta will become if Governor Brown builds these tunnels. Please stop the tunnels.	<p>Effects of the alternatives on salinity levels are described in Chapter 8, Water Quality, and Appendix 8H, Electrical Conductivity, EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Modeling results indicate that the implementation of the water conveyance facilities may positively or adversely affect in-Delta water quality, depending on a number of factors including location, time of year, and hydrologic conditions. See tables in Appendices 8E through 8N for specific results related to various water quality constituents (including bromide and chloride).</p> <p>In addition to potential effects associated with the project and alternatives, modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the proposed project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 14, Water Quality, for more details regarding effects of the alternatives on salinity levels.</p>
4227	1	I know the Sacramento Delta system is a vital environmental link for migrating birds, fish species and other creatures. Its resources can be shared, within reason. But it cannot be plummeted for the benefit of a few.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
4228	1	If we start leeching water from our Delta it will totally change life for the people that live and work there, but also for the love of the animals and other living things that make the Delta their home.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place).
4229	1	This will devastate our fisheries. Farm lands.	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. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 5 (Conservation Measure 1 as a Conservation Measure) and Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation).
4230	1	The tunnels are a boondoggle.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4231	1	We all need clean water as humans, not big agriculture of Westland, nor any water hogs that should be in eastern 2/3rds of US.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
4231	2	No Delta tunnels. No toxic fracking of what little water a 500 year drought gives us.	<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>
4232	1	I do not want the Delta destroyed!	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.
4233	1	Opposing tunnels and water export to the south. Save the Delta Estuary.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4234	1	The true reasons for the tunnels [have] not been disclosed and I fear it will lead to the privatization of water which I hold as a sovereign right for all of Earth's inhabitants.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
4235	1	I oppose moving water from the Delta. It is a fishery nursery, home for water fowl and keeps our farmers going.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years.
4236	1	Jerry Brown, you have no right to destroy the environment and kill animals. This is the worst kind of crime against our earth and for what, greed. Your reason of protecting	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Sacramento from flooding is a complete joke. Come on, we are not that stupid.	point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4237	1	I am Delta kid and these tunnels will ruin our beloved Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4238	1	This is highway robbery of public property and essential assets. Stop it again, stop it now!	Among the key changes included in Alternatives 4, 4A, 2D, and 5A is the relocation of key project features from private property to public property already owned by DWR. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input.
4239	1	Governor Brown is a fascist and needs to be recalled and his projects ended.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4240	1	I do not want the Sacramento Delta to become the 21st century equivalent of the Owens Valley debacle.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Regulatory laws and conditions are much different today, and they make it impossible for one region to take advantage of another to such a degree. Under the stringent environmental statutes in place today, including the Endangered Species Act, operation of the proposed water delivery system could not drain the Delta rivers and channels dry, including the Sacramento River. The proposed project's facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants, would be operated in accordance with permits issued by, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the State Water Resources Control Board, among other agencies. The proposed project would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards.
4241	1	I believe that the Delta and the Bay will be harmed by this and Northern California's wildlife will suffer greatly too. Plus it will never be enough. If they got all the water they think they need tomorrow they will start making plans for thinking else and want even more. Find a better way.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 4 (Alternatives), and Master Response 6 (Demand Management).
4242	1	Tthe Delta Tunnels make absolutely no sense! We need more reservoirs, not this ridiculous plan.	For information regarding why water storage was not included in the proposed project, refer to Master Response 37 (Water Storage) and Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.
4243	1	I live next to the Delta. My kids were born and raised on the water! This is where our family retreats to get away from video games and the city. We fish, wakeboard, ski, jet ski, tube and joy ride the beautiful Delta. Please do not take this from my family and local economy!	On-water recreation such as fishing, wakeboarding, jet skiing, tubing, and boating would still be accessible throughout the Delta during and after construction of the proposed project. Impacts to boating are discussed in Impacts REC-3 and 7.
4244	1	I am strongly opposed to redirecting water from the Delta and endangering the health of the local ecology -- fish and wildlife -- and the local economy. There are better ways for the south to increase its water supply.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 4 (Alternatives), and Master Response 6 (Demand Management).
4245	1	This is ridiculous. We do not have enough water for our Delta and farmers. And when we do, it's exported as it is! I cannot even imagine what it would be like if they had the ability to give (sell) more away. Southern California needs to look into desalination plants, not count on water from the north even more!	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
4246	1	We need to support the use of gray water systems and stop building huge, destructive infrastructure that destroys our natural environment.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.
4247	1	Once you kill the Delta it will not come back. The Delta should be an eco sanctuary, not a ruined salt flat.	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 Delta ecosystem is in a continuing decline, which impacts protected species and long-term water supplies. Over the last 150 years, the Delta has been altered by a system of manmade levees, reservoirs, and dredged waterways constructed to support farming and urban development and to provide flood protection for local towns and cities. Many other factors affect species health in the Delta, including water quality issues, nonnative species, illegal fishing, and local water diversions. The Delta is also threatened by continuing land subsidence, seismic risk, and effects of climate change. The proposed project would make water deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. It does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts.
4248	1	I believe it is insane [to] waste energy moving water from a fertile agricultural region to supply water to corporate farms on unsustainable desert soils. Save California's underground aquifers!	<p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p>
4249	1	The Delta is sick. Needs our help. Leave it be. No tunnels	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such 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.
4250	1	Our family has enjoyed the recreational opportunities the Delta provides for over 30 years. Our children were practically raised in our ski boat. Not to mention the ecological and economical impacts that stealing our water and sending it to Southern California would create. It's a bad plan and it needs to stop!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		With our system is in place and so many aspects of our lives depend on it, who in their right mind would want to destroy it?	holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 3 for more information on the purpose and need for the proposed project.
4251	1	This project will destroy the largest freshwater estuary on the US west coast. And it will do nothing to alleviate the drought. The diverted water will go to farmers growing water thirsty crops in the naturally dry Central Valley while the State government, namely Jerry Brown, uses eminent domain to force the Delta's local farmers out. The plan is a disgrace and must be stopped.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
4252	1	You cannot fix the Delta by draining it.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years.
4253	1	Save California's underground aquifers!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4254	1	It is totally abnormal to think that the tunnel is [more] for exports [than] for California people!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4255	1	I disagree with the governor on this one: the tunnels will be disastrous on every front. Please do not.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
4256	1	I use the Delta for recreation and even the recent changes pushed by the California Governor are a disaster (blocking a slough caused rip currents elsewhere. Apparently political idiots in Sacramento have never heard the old saying "you can not hold back the tide").	Waterways will still be navigable during construction and operation of the proposed project. The proposed project would result in temporary impacts to boaters and on-water recreationists. However, the project includes plans to reduce those impacts as much as possible with implementation of environmental commitments to prepare and implement a water navigation plan and provide notification of construction and maintenance activities in waterways (Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments). Additionally, Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a would reduce impacts on marine navigation by development and implementation of site-specific construction traffic management plans, including specific measures related to management of barges and stipulations to notify the commercial and leisure boating communities of proposed barge operations in the waterways. Barge routes and landing sites will be selected by the construction contractor and will be expected to comply with the following criteria:

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximize continuous waterway access between departure port and shaft site • Maintain minimum waterway width greater than 100 feet (assuming maximum barge width of 50 feet) • Use of existing barge landings where possible • Minimum water depth of 6 feet
4257	1	The peripheral tunnels will only destroy the Sacramento River and the Delta. This will displace hundreds of residence and many existing farms in the Delta itself. This project will not increase the water supply to the westlands corporate farmer or Southern California water users. It's another waste of taxpayer money.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding).
4258	1	I do not want any tunnels built in California just not right. Going to take away our farm land.	Impacts to agriculture are identified and discussed in Chapter 14; Lead Agencies have proposed measures that would support and protect agricultural production in the Delta by securing agricultural easements and/or by seeking opportunities to protect and enhance agriculture with a focus on maintaining economic activity on agricultural lands.
4259	1	I am signing this because it would affect greatly our valley farmers! Who feed the world! Why would we take away from the men and women who work to feed us?!	The impact analysis in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, addresses the potential for effects associated with temporary construction activities, footprint of disturbance of new water conveyance facilities and CM2–CM11, CM13, CM15, CM16, CM20, CM21, or Environmental Commitments 3, 4, 6–11, 15 and 16 under the non-HCP alternatives, and operation of the action alternatives within the study area. Relying on spatial data from the California Departments of Conservation and Water Resources, as well as project-specific data describing the location of project components, this section considers conversion of agricultural land designated as Important Farmland (Prime, Unique, Statewide Importance, and Local Importance) and subject to Williamson Act contracts or in Farmland Security Zones. Project-specific data also determined whether features would create footprint effects that would be temporary/short-term or permanent in nature. The section also describes potential changes to agricultural viability from the project as it relates to operational effects on water quality, groundwater elevation, and inundation frequency. Finally, the section considers several indirect consequences on agricultural resources that may result from implementation of the action alternatives.
4260	1	The Delta is nearby and a beautiful place for recreation and just stopping to enjoy nature. Please don't destroy this!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4261	1	Government is out of control and they need to be stopped from robbing the people.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4262	1	I'm signing because we need to take care of our resources! This is destruction and it needs to stop!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4263	1	The tunnels will allow the salt water from the sea to come in to the rivers and destroy all of the marine life that we have in the rivers	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
4264	1	The tunnels add no water whatsoever to the state's supply. We need more water, not	The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of a particular water supply augmentation approach (solely

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		less, and the only way to do that is reclamation and desalination.	<p>via reclamation and desalination) and does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the range of alternatives selected. The alternatives included in the Draft EIR/EIS represent a legally adequate reasonable range of alternatives and the scope of the analysis of alternatives fully complies with both CEQA and NEPA. The Lead Agencies carefully considered all potential alternatives that were proposed during the scoping process and during time of preparation of the Draft EIR/EIS. In response to public input, several new alternatives have been studied in the Recirculated DEIR/EIS and a new preferred Alternative (4A) identified.</p> <p>Please also see Master Response 3 for information on the purpose and need for the proposed project. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> <p>Please also see Master Response 7 regarding desalination.</p>
4265	1	I live on the delta, have swam, fished, ate the best farm produce, my entire adult life and want to protect this treasure for my grandchildren. I voted against the canal in the eighties and thought that it was finished. This can't be legal. It's the canal just underground!	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 36 (Peripheral Canal).</p>
4266	1	This is nuts. The Delta has some of the richest farm land in the world. Jerry Brown is paying back his money men for their support. This does not benefit the people of California... It only supports Jerry Brown's friends.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4267	1	It was wrong in 1982 and it's wrong now. We need our water here.	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 36 (Peripheral Canal).</p>
4268	1	We need to preserve the Delta and all the fish! Find another way or place! Preserve this part of California water ways and life and the people who are doing all we can to save water! Is Los Angeles doing the same... Oh I forgot to mention one other very important thing... Our farmers need the water! Do you like wine, fruit and vegetables grown from this part of California? We don't need more precarious imports and we need to keep economy busy right here in this part of our California! Stop worrying about the rich part of California... They can survive without us... We need it more and guess what, we have every right to preserve our Delta!	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply), and Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports).</p>
4269	1	Those tunnels would ruin the Delta.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			operational flexibility.
4270	1	You know that building the tunnel is not a good use of resources, nor is it good for the resources. We must take a much broader look at what is good for California and especially the delicate ecology of a Delta. I oppose the building of the Tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 4 (Alternatives) and Master Response 6 (Demand Management).
4271	1	This project is too invasive on so many levels. It will adversely affect the environment. It will intrude on people's personal property. And it will cost the taxpayers too much money.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 5 (Funding) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
4272	1	Destroying the Delta will ruin the state.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4273	1	I do not want to see the beauty of the Delta destroyed. We need to find other ways to get water to southern California.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. 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 4 (Alternatives) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
4274	1	The amount of disregard to our current drought situation is astonishing. I worked in southern California at the beginning of the year and everywhere I looked residential or commercial there seemed to be no effort in conserving water.	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). The Proposed Project has been developed in a manner that would be supportive of the California Water Action Plan. 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.
4275	1	Taking water from the Delta will harm the local ecology on land and the water. We don't need to create more imbalances for the profit of a few.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports).
4276	1	This and the bullet train are the biggest most ridiculous boondoggles of California government and we are the laughing stock of the country! Not proud to say I am from California!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4277	1	The Delta is an important agricultural asset to Northern California. Why should LA get the benefit of our great foresight and water planning. LA needs to get their act together and start thinking about water solutions without draining Northern California's water systems. Also-has anybody noticed that Northern California is also suffering deeply from drought, fires, etc.?! Do not drain Northern California's water system. It would be a disaster for not only humans but all of the wild life (who don't get to vote!)	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply), and Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports).
4278	1	Because I care more about Delta wildlife having the environment necessary to thrive rather than Southern Californians having water for their pools and lawns. Southern California has the poorest water management and respect for resources around!	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p> <p>The proposed project is one component, among many, of the California Water Action Plan. In its efforts to achieve the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration, the project seeks to protect dozens of species of fish and wildlife in the Delta while also securing reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California. The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/.</p> <p>Refer Master Response 5 regarding demand management, Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project and Master Response 35 regarding Southern California water supply.</p>
4279	1	This will be bad for the delta and many species. It will help continue fracking and industrial ag--both of which should be banned.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to stipulated beneficial uses including: agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses such as fish protection flows. Fracking presumably could be an "industrial" use of water. As of the present, hydraulic fracturing is a lawful use of water, as state law generally permits...." (California Public Resources Code, § 3106[b].) Finally, the project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole and not as a result of oil corporations or large agribusinesses.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4280	1	Our past water projects resulted in unsustainable growth that cannot survive the current drought. Stop this madness, leave our water alone.	<p>As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management). These actions are being considered to meet future water demands for planned municipal uses consistent with water demand projections in the recent Urban Water Management Plans submitted to DWR which include approaches to meet the 20 percent reduction per capita urban water use by 2020.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p>
4281	1	This project is ridiculously expensive and environmentally irresponsible.	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Cost).</p>
4282	1	I am opposed to a water management plan that robs from and destroys the agriculture in one part of the state to support uses in another part of the state.	<p>Impacts to agriculture are identified and discussed in Chapter 14; Lead Agencies have proposed measures that would support and protect agricultural production in the Delta by securing agricultural easements and/or by seeking opportunities to protect and enhance agriculture with a focus on maintaining economic activity on agricultural lands. See Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation).</p>
4283	1	I don't want any more of our water deviated to Southern California. It is killing our environment. Build desalination plants not tunnels from Northern California we need our water!	<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 7 regarding desalination. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
4284	1	The tunnels will destroy the Delta and our business.	<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 24 (The Delta As A Place).</p>
4285	1	I believe that these tunnels will destroy the ecosystem, the local farmers ability to sustain crops and just be a mess to our way of life in general here in nothern California.	<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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Now if there were not a drought to begin with. The priorities are backward, it would make more sense for us to have Southern California send us some of their water, as they're more abundant in rainfall lately!	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 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
4286	1	Money should be spent on more dams and desalination plants.	<p>The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of a particular water supply augmentation approach (more storage, desalination) and does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>While water storage is a critically important tool for managing California's water resources, it is not a topic that must be addressed in the EIR/EIS for the proposed project. This is because the proposed project does not, and need not, propose storage as a project component. Although the physical facilities contemplated by the proposed project once up and running would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, the proposed project is a stand-alone project for purposes of CEQA and NEPA, just as future storage projects would be. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, of the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage. Please see Master Response 37 regarding water storage.</p>
4287	1	Jerry Brown only cares about money \$\$ Not the future of Northern California Farmers and Residents that depend on the Delta to survive	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.
4288	1	I am opposed to the delta tunnels and the communists in the Sacramento Legislature. They are flat out anti California and America.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4289	1	This is an absurd way to address this problem.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4290	1	The delta needs to be left alone to support wildlife.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
4291	1	I'm a northern California resident who frequents the Delta. Southern California is already wrecking the ecosystem in this area. Tunneling more there would only make things worse for this entire region.	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) and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
4292	1	I've lived here my entire life enjoying the Delta. Now I want my first grandson to enjoy it too! I signed a petition in the seventies when I was 6 years old and I'm going to keep signing them until you stop this nonsense!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4293	1	There is much better ways to get more water down south. This is horrible for the delta,	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		and bay. It's just a way to make money for the construction companies.	Delta and new operating criteria 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 4 (Alternatives).
4294	1	This is not the legacy you want to leave when you leave office. It will be a legacy of complete and utter failure that wreaks environmental destruction. You talk of climate change and saving our environment and then talk out of the other side of your mouth when it comes to the Delta. Do the right thing; do the moral thing. Stop the tunnels.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
4295	1	1. it won't work to generate any new water 2. it's too expensive 3. it won't increase reliability 4. it'll destroy the Delta 5. there are cheaper/better options	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place), Master Response 4 (Alternatives), Master Response 6 (Demand Management) and Master Response 5.
4296	1	This will not fix our state's water problems.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environment impacts in the EIR/S were raised.
4297	1	This has to be stopped. Total devastation of our delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4298	1	This is so wrong! Look for the greatest good, this is not it!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
4299	1	We need to save the delicate ecosystem of the California delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4300	1	We should work on increasing our water supplies rather than removing the ever more limited resources of the delta region.	<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. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.</p> <p>Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. 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. Overall, the average annual Delta exports are less in Alternatives 2, 4 (H2, H3, H4), and 5 through 9 than under Existing Conditions, as shown in Figure 5-17 of Chapter 5, Water Supply, of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems,</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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).
4301	1	I'm a Californian from the San Joaquin Valley and object to the short-sighted tactics that only benefit Big Ag.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
4302	1	This is where I grew up. Where my family lives. There are more environmentally friendly methods to utilize.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4303	1	I live on the Delta and I want it undisputed! I aid and still buy a lot of money to live where I play!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4304	1	Nature at its finest and most useful, it needs to be saved!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4305	1	As a lifelong Californian, it would be heartbreaking to see the loss or extreme degradation of this natural wonder. Saltwater intrusion up the Sacramento River, incomprehensible amount of freshwater siphoned off for water intensive crops in the San Joaquin Delta, and enabling continued water waste in Southern California isn't worth it. That and the fact that some estimates have the tunnels costing more than \$50 billion. No tunnels!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply), Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 14 (Salinity), and Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding).
4306	1	This will not save the delta. In fact it will just destroy it with no added benefit to anybody except the largest water hogs in Southern California.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water) and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
4307	1	Southern California needs to build dams and retain the water that falls from the sky instead of taking the water from up here where the farmers and people need that water. Don't destroy our Delta!	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 (Demand Management) for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>The California WaterFix (referred to in the FEIR/FEIS as Alternative 4A) is DWR's preferred alternative under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Reclamation's preferred alternative under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Alternative 4A addresses the reverse flow problem by focusing on the construction and operation of new north Delta intakes and on habitat restoration commensurate with the footprint of these new facilities. The construction and operation of new conveyance facilities would help resolve many of the concerns with the current south Delta conveyance system while otherwise helping to reduce threats to endangered and threatened species in the Delta through habitat restoration, as necessary to mitigate significant environmental effects and satisfy applicable ESA and CESA standards. Implementing a dual conveyance system, in which water could be diverted from either the north or the south or both, depending on the needs of aquatic organisms, would align water operations to better reflect natural seasonal flow patterns by creating new water diversions in the north Delta equipped with state-of-the-art fish screens. The new system would reduce the ongoing physical impacts associated with sole reliance on the southern diversion facilities and allow for greater operational flexibility to better protect fish. Minimizing south Delta pumping would provide more natural east-west flow patterns. The new diversions would also help protect critical water supplies against the threats of sea level rise and earthquakes.</p> <p>The plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Although the project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented California Waterfix project would be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) for further information.</p>
4308	1	Bad move Governor Brown. No tunnels with my tax dollars!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4309	1	I am signing as I am against massive transfer of water from Northern California to the South. We will be destroyed by this action.	For information about water transfers and their potential impacts, please refer to Master Response 43 (Water Transfers) and the discussion in the EIR/EIS documentation: Chapter 5-Water Supply. 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.
4310	1	I'm signing this because I live on the Delta and see the beautiful animals that would be hurt by the tunnels, I know the farmers who will be directly affected, the shock waves the tunnels will have. There is a better way! Governor Brown I remember you taking away paper bags because they were harmful for the environment and replacing them with plastic, now years later you see the effects that has had on the environment and you're banning plastic bags, similar situation think things through!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4311	1	I'm signing this because the Jerry Brown Administration has lost its collective minds. It seems to be an ego trip by the Governor, a trip I don't want to be on.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4312	1	The tunnels will not increase water storage, they will damage the delta ecosystem and worsen salt intrusion. The damage cannot be mitigated. Find a better solution.	<p>It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Although many of the proposed alternatives included meritorious water policy principles, the proposals rejected by the Lead Agencies did not qualify as appropriate alternatives for various reasons. For example, proposals were rejected because they were inconsistent with the project's objectives and purpose and need or included components that are beyond the scope of the project. The text of the Draft EIR/EIS in Chapter 3 (section 3.2) and Appendix 3A to that document thoroughly explain the process used to develop the alternatives, and explain why certain potential alternatives were considered but ultimately rejected by the Lead Agencies.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives), Master Response 14 (Salinity), Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), and Master Response 37 (Storage).</p>
4313	1	I'm signing because I'm concerned that the construction will have substantial environmental impacts on the Delta.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Construction-related impacts are disclosed in individual resource area chapters in the EIR/EIS. All impacts would be minimized and mitigated to the degree feasible, as noted under each alternative in the EIR/EIS individual resource chapters and in Appendix 3B (Environmental Commitments) of the EIR/EIS.
4314	1	I am signing because the tunnels are destructive towards the delta. The Delta cannot sustain greedy Southern Californian's Department of Water and Power. The state should advocate controlled growth in our desert communities.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The Lead Agencies do not have local land use planning authority or control or local zoning practices. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
4315	1	If this goes through, our delta will be no more, all of the wildlife will die . I remember when my older sister took me with her and her friends to apose the California aqueduct. Enough is enough. We need to cut off the supply to the California aqueduct as well. Let them find their own water down there. The San Joaquin and Stanislaus counties supply 85% of The U.S. food.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Chapter 12 of the EIR/EIS for impacts and mitigation for terrestrial resources. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4315	2	Split the state in two.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.
4316	1	The Governor is out of his mind fooling with mother nature and the magnificent Northern California waterways. Please signup and help save our area.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4317	1	We need to conserve and protect, not eliminate and destroy!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4318	1	I want to save our water.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4319	1	I love my waterways and I think it is very destructive to allow such a project to take the heart of our livelihood away. There has to be another solution for southern California. This is not it!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 4 (Alternatives), and Master Response 24 (Delta as A Place).
4320	1	We need water more than apples.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4321	1	The tunnels will destroy the Delta. Diverting water to Southern California is not the answer. More infrastructure (reservoirs) is needed. Honest politicians would be a great place to start. Stop whoring our resources. Grow a conscious and honor a moral code. The greed of those chasing money with destroy the Delta.	The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of a particular water supply augmentation approach (more storage) and does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Please see Master Response 37 regarding water storage.
4322	1	My city's water supply (Antioch) source is from the Delta. These tunnels won't create any new water, but it will divert an outrageous amount of water to Southern California. This will cause San Francisco Bay Water to back up the Delta increasing salinity levels, resulting in even poorer water quality than we already experience. This needs to be stopped now!	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. Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the EIR/EIS discloses the potential water quality impacts resulting from constructing and operating the proposed project. See also Master Response 14 (Water Quality), Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports).
4323	1	I want to protect the water and our northern California beauty. This is a theft of our natural beauty and resources by Governor Jerry Brown. He is not doing right by the people. His fix as usual is to line the pockets of Southern California Business. Once any man changes the natural landscape it can never return to its original beauty. I stand up against Jerry Brown destroying the environment and stealing from Northern California. Someone should remind him that he is Governor for the entire state.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4324	1	Governor Brown, have a real water conservation plan, not just band-aids.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4325	1	I am solidly against the tunnels. I don't believe taxpayers should subsidize agriculture large or small. Furthermore, why should we subsidize billions of dollars in an industry that makes up only 2% of our state's Gross Domestic Product? It's environmentally atrocious and wrong. Stop it!	DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, 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>
4326	1	I live in a city that gets its water from the Delta. If this tremendously stupid bill goes through, it would negatively impact our drinking water in such a way to make it almost untreatable!	Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the EIR/EIS discloses the potential water quality impacts resulting from constructing and operating the proposed project. See also Master Response 14 (Water Quality).
4327	1	This is an atrocity and a slap in the face to we in Northern California! Nothing but selfishness and greed coming from Big Corporate Agriculture from Southern California! I'm tired of it and there should be a criminal investigation and criminal charges against Governor Jerry Takeabride Brown!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4328	1	The delta tunnels are a horrible idea and will cause irreparable damage to the delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4329	1	Southern California needs to stop being so water greedy. We aren't rich but we are human. Someone has to grow all their fancy food.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply) and Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
4330	1	I'm signing because we need the water up here in its original area for our wildlife and fisheries, period. Stop sending water to a desert.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports) and Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
4331	1	I believe this would be detrimental to our wild life. We contribute enough.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Chapter 12 of the EIR/EIS for impacts to and mitigation for terrestrial resources.
4332	1	I'm signing because I do not feel that it right to drain the Delta to ship water to Southern California. The fisheries and wildlife habitat of so many species needs to be protected and the water preserved for agriculture. Southern California chose to not build water storage facilities over expanding housing--poor decision then--do not destroy the Delta because of the lack of planning in the south.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be roughly the same as the average annual amount

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports) and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
4333	1	Build reservoirs! Plan for normal droughts. Salt water moving upstream will do irreparable damage. Maybe watch Chinatown Mr. Brown!	Additional water storage was eliminated from consideration in the Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS through the alternatives development and screening process (discussed in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives). As such, the proposed project does not propose storage as a project component. Although the proposed project would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, Alternative 4A is a stand-alone project which demonstrates independent utility just as future storage projects would demonstrate. Please refer to Master Response 37 (Storage) for additional information.
4334	1	I'm signing because I feel the tunnels will destroy the Delta. Our communities around the Delta are already hurting because of drought. Our rich farmland feeds the world, we need the water. Our water is in danger of becoming unusable if too much salt from sea. Fishing and fowl will suffer, humans will suffer. No amount of money is worth those tunnels.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 14 (Salinity), and Master Response 24 (Delta As a Place).
4335	1	The Sacramento River provides fresh water to the entire delta region south of Sacramento, and keeps the salt water from flowing into the estuary. There are many different species of wildlife that depend on the river and the entire delta region for survival. In addition, the river and delta provide water to local farmers who have farmed the region for over a century. The construction alone would destroy habitat for thousands of migratory birds, who may never return to the area, and destroy precious farmland held by families who have relied on the river for generations. Moreover, in years of low rainfall, there is less water flowing down the river and siphoning it away from the delta region would utterly destroy this beautiful natural resource. The system is fragile and it should not be tampered with! Anyone who values the environment and understands ecology would be opposed to this horribly destructive project.	DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Resource areas are addressed separately in the EIR/EIS under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments and mitigation measures will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible. Regarding farmland impacts, please see FEIR/EIS Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, Impact AG-1 and Impact AG-2 and their associated mitigation measures for complete analysis of how the proposed project will effect and mediate important farmland in the Delta.
4336	1	Stop the money grabbers. Please stop killing the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4337	1	I don't believe what Governor Brown is doing is in the public's interest. In fact I believe it's for his interests and his associates only.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4338	1	The tunnels make no sense ecologically or environmentally. It's going to ruin a whole region and ecosystem to support billionaire farmers who are growing water-intensive crops in the desert, most of which are being exported overseas.	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		It was stupid to build farms there in the first place. Let's not keep an unsustainable endeavor going and ruin a region in the process.	salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
4339	1	It is a giant waste of tax dollars. It creates no new water storage, and that is just plain stupid!	<p>As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in surface water and groundwater storage, agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management). Please refer to Master Response 5.</p>
4340	1	I believe the delta is an important resource we have to conserve	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4341	1	Having been raised in the Delta, I am very aware of the many issues, most importantly salt water intrusion and the loss of habitats due to this and its affects on farming. A tunnel or any other type system that drains water from the Delta will a massive fail. The only solution to help the Delta is draining off less water.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 14 (Salinity), and Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports).
4342	1	I am against the tunnels. It will destroy the delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered 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.
4343	1	Southern California has bought enough water rights. They need to come to terms with the fact that they have outgrown their resources and look for alternative measures. Desalinization, more reservoirs, moratoriums on building unless the plans include gray water usage for landscaping. We are raping our land and limiting our sustainable future. This plan has no benefits. California and the rest of the country could be impacted by loss of agricultural lands.	The commenter does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.
4344	1	The delta's water needs to be left alone. Transferring the water out of there will hurt the lives depending on the delta for their well being. This includes humans and non humans. It will alter the salinity of the entire delta allowing invasive species to thrive--which in turn will kill the key indicator species, the delta smelt already an endangered fish along	By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		with all the other delta native species.	federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 14 (Salinity), Master Response 17 (Impacts on Smelt), Master Response 5 (Conservation Measure 1 as a CM), and Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports).
4345	1	<p>This is another problem. No water means no food.</p> <p>Southern California needs to build desalination plants if they want to irrigate their desert for green lawns and drink water too.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives (such as desalination) that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project. However, nothing in the proposed project would prevent other entities from pursuing innovative approaches to desalination or other water supply solutions. As described in Appendix 3A, Section 3A.7, Results of Initial Screening of Conveyance Alternatives, EIR/EIS (2013), desalination was included as part of Alternative B7. Issues related to desalination include land use impacts, costs, and substantial energy use requirements. Advances in technology have improved feasibility of desalination and as a statewide water use planning component; it will be evaluated by water agencies on a local/regional level.</p> <p>Desalination, the process of removing salt and other minerals from seawater to make it suitable for drinking or irrigation, is being implemented in several California communities. However, it has not proven viable to secure adequate water supplies to meet California's needs due to high costs and energy demands.</p> <p>Today, desalination creates an estimated 84,000 acre-feet of potable water a year in the state, mostly through treatment of brackish groundwater, which is less salty and cheaper to treat than sea water. In comparison, the proposed project would secure an estimated 4.7 to 5.2 million acre-feet of water to supply more than 25 million people and 3 million acres of farmland.</p> <p>Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Local water agencies will need to invest in additional strategies and technologies, including desalination, to meet future water demand.</p> <p>The proposed project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies needed to meet California's overall water management needs. It is not a substitute for increased commitments to other water supply solutions, including recycling, desalination, water conservation and storage.</p> <p>Please also see Master Response 7 regarding desalination.</p>
4346	1	<p>Save my childhood memories</p> <p>This is crazy the water belongs there.</p>	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4347	1	I believe the construction of the tunnels that will divert water from the San Francisco Bay delta will be detrimental to the Delta ecosystem.	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).
4348	1	Tunnels are not the answer to the problem. The research has already been done, and that's what it shows wake up.	Since 2006, the 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.
4349	1	I don't want our Delta waterways touched. In a time where more awareness is made in	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The Delta ecosystem is in a continuing decline, which impacts protected species and long-term water

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		preserving our natural resources, it doesn't make any sense.	supplies. Over the last 150 years, the Delta has been altered by a system of manmade levees, reservoirs, and dredged waterways constructed to support farming and urban development and to provide flood protection for local towns and cities. Many other factors affect species health in the Delta, including water quality issues, nonnative species, illegal fishing, and local water diversions. The Delta is also threatened by continuing land subsidence, seismic risk, and effects of climate change. The proposed project would make water deliveries more predictable and reliable, while improving native fish migratory patterns. It does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts.
4350	1	I don't want the Delta to be siphoned off to the highest bidder.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4351	1	I am against the Water Fix because these large water districts do not take precedence over state welfare. No more Owens River Valleys. At the same time big agriculture interests are different than those of the people of California. This needs to stop.	<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 proposed project's facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants, would be operated in accordance with permits issued by, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the State Water Resources Control Board, among other agencies. The proposed project would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>It is not the result of "favoring" large corporations (e.g., large agribusinesses). In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority.</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
4352	1	I'm sick of corporate America always getting its way and ruining everything without a single thought for anything or anyone else other than themselves and their investors. We have to stop them! Jerry Brown is the biggest jerk who has no business being in charge. Yet another awful thing he's going to do before he leaves office. What a scumbag! We support the state, not the big corporations-they don't pay any taxes and only give bribes to the politicians. What a scam!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4353	1	It's appalling to sit back and watch greedy persons of unimaginable wealth take over our resources.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4354	1	I care a great deal about the families, and their generations of farming /land ownership, in the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. In its efforts to achieve the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration, the California WaterFix seeks to protect dozens of species of fish and wildlife in the Delta while also securing reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California. Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed California WaterFix.
4355	1	There are better alternatives than destroying an already over burdened ecosystem.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 4 for a discussion on alternatives associated with the proposed project and Master Response 3 for more information on the purpose and need for the project.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4356	1	I want my kids and grandkids to be able to enjoy fishing, boating and hinting and to just enjoy the beauty of the outdoors which is becoming extinct.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4357	1	I don't agree with Governor Brown. He doesn't know what he's talking about.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4358	1	I do not want to see another Owen's Valley. Leave the Delta alone!	<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> <p>Regulatory laws and conditions are much different today, and they make it impossible for one region to take advantage of another to such a degree. Under the stringent environmental statutes in place today, including the Endangered Species Act, operation of the proposed water delivery system could not drain the Delta rivers and channels dry, including the Sacramento River. The proposed project's facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants, would be operated in accordance with permits issued by, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the State Water Resources Control Board, among other agencies. The proposed project would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards.</p>
4359	1	We need to find a better solution to fixing this drought and water problem. Ruining a habitat is not good at all. For earth and for the people.	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) and Master Response 4 (Alternatives).
4360	1	Governor Brown is trying to destroy California's natural wildlife.	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.
4361	1	Taking water from one area of the state and giving it to another is not sustainable and a terrible idea.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
4362	1	Why do we allow fracking in the Delta? We do not have enough water in this state for that! Fracking can cause earthquakes and levees to fail.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.</p> <p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows. Fracking - or "hydraulic fracturing" -- presumably could be an "industrial" use of water, and is a lawful use of</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
4363	1	I do not want see a beautiful part of our planet destroyed for the benefit of rich farmers or politicians.	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.
4364	1	The tunnels do nothing to support the fish and wild life of the delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such 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).
4365	1	I'm so furious with the way politicians rape the land to make a buck. There is no long term, sustainable thinking. It should be illegal to farm the wetlands farm land.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4366	1	Stop using drinking water for refining petroleum and fracking, then there will not be a need for shipping yet more water (that we do not have) down south. Less expensive to revamp old water deals. No more water to commercial bottlers, no more growing crops that require high amounts of water. All of this is common sense. Stop giving away our water to corporations.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to stipulated beneficial uses including: agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses such as fish protection flows. Fracking presumably could be an "industrial" use of water. As of the present, hydraulic fracturing is a lawful use of water, as state law generally permits. (California Public Resources Code, § 3106[b].) Finally, the project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole and not as a result of oil corporations or large agribusinesses. The environmental documentation and project approval will be acted upon by the decision makers from each lead agency at the conclusion of the final environmental documentation for both CEQA and NEPA. Refer to Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
4367	1	I don't want the twin tunnels built, destroying all the Delta and the habitat therein.	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.
4368	1		No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4368	1	The Stanislaus does not need to lose any more water. If you haven't heard Jerry Brown we are in a drought. Our farmers need water for their crops.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
4369	1	The two tunnels project will increase salinity levels in the Delta, destroy what's left of the fisheries and what little freshwater flows there are left into the San Francisco Bay.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. . By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Refer to Master Response 45 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 19 (Salinity), and Master Response 49 (Conservation Measure 1 as a CM).
4370	1	The San Francisco Bay Delta is a natural resource that plays an important part for the natural state of the ecology. The Delta Tunnels would be another step is destroying what is naturally necessary for a healthy state. Please do what is right. The Delta Tunnels are no good.	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).
4371	1	Robbing Peter to pay Paul is not a solution to the increasing our water supply, we have an ocean of water right next to us. Some leadership and innovation will help us to tap that ocean forever. An endless supply of water and lots of renewable solar wind and wave energy right where you need it. Leave our water alone, fish in the Delta are just the canary in the coal mine.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
4372	1	We need to stop these tunnels. They will ruin the environment.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4373	1	Oppose shipping water south at the expense of fish and delta salinity	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 14 (Salinity), and Master Response 5 (Conservation Measure 1 as a CM).
4374	1	The Delta is already in bad shape. Removing water from upstream will only make it worse.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4375	1	Instead of tunnels to nowhere, make a tunnel of the peripheral canal by shielding it from evaporation with solar panels.	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.
4376	1	The tunnels are a terrible idea, with untold repercussions that haven't been researched,	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		and won't be researched.	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. Resource areas are addressed separately under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible.
4377	1	I live less than half a mile away from the Delta. This is my backyard! This plan is flawed and will not solve the water crisis. It will simply divert our water and create new problems.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).
4378	1	It is fundamentally wrong to do this. The tunnels will continue to destroy the natural resources that we have. Money should be spent on making what we have more efficient and in renewable sources.	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. Appendix 1C of the Final EIR/EIS, Demand Management Measures, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. Please also refer to the following: Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 4 (Alternatives Development), Master Response 6 (Desalination/ Demand Management), and Master Response 7 (Desalination). Although components such as desalination plants and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the State, they are beyond the scope of the project.
4379	1	I am a recreational angler that utilizes the Delta on a regular basis with my family and friends and don't want to see it drained to benefit a few billionaire farmers.	The Delta will not be drained. Please refer to Master Response 26 regarding Delta exports and 53 regarding striped bass. For more information regarding impacts to recreation and its associated mitigation measures please see Chapter 15 of the FEIR/EIS.
4380	1	[The WaterFix] will ruin our Delta and the life in it!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4381	1	The natural ecosystem of the Delta must not be tampered with. The need to build and maintain a water retention system throughout the state is at hand. Build reservoirs, don't drain the Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. For information regarding why water storage was not included in the proposed project, refer to Master Response 37 (Water Storage) and Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 4 for additional details on the

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			selection of alternatives.
4382	1	Save natural habitat.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4383	1	I don't want the Delta impacted by less water. The construction will also affect the sensitive ecology.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Construction-related impacts are disclosed in individual resource area chapters in the EIR/EIS. All impacts would be minimized and mitigated to the degree feasible, as noted under each alternative in the EIR/EIS individual resource chapters and in Appendix 3B (Environmental Commitments) of the EIR/EIS.
4384	1	I believe that the Delta Tunnels will do significant damage to the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta. The project will lead to over-pumping and increases salinization of the waters in the Delta, causing irreparable damage to farms and water quality.	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. Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the EIR/EIS discloses the potential water quality impacts resulting from constructing and operating the proposed project. See also Master Response 14 (Water Quality).
4385	1	I'm 46 years old and have enjoyed the Delta since I learned to water-ski at 6 years old. Through the years I've witnessed a continued deterioration of the Delta on the Tracy side. Your 60 billion dollar plan at my expense does not create any more water to flush this toilet bowl nor create more water for the survivability of the Delta. Instead you wish to rob the vital resource [of] the Delta and keep it flushing to give to some cropland that supports selling almonds to another country. How could such wise people make these water deals when we are actually in a drought? Infuriates me when elected officials circumvent the goodwill of the citizens and environment in the name of greed.	<p>Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
4386	1	It's counterintuitive for a supposed environmentalist like Governor Brown to be promoting a project with such disastrous environmental consequences as this "tunnel" project.	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. Impacts related to the proposed project are disclosed in individual resource area chapters in the EIR/EIS. All impacts would be minimized and mitigated to the degree feasible, as noted under each alternative in the EIR/EIS individual resource chapters and in Appendix 3B (Environmental Commitments) of the EIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose/Need).
4387	1	Don't drain the Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Exports).
4388	1	Governor Brown is either motivated by money or is completely insane and needs to be removed from the office of Governor of California immediately, as his tunnels would surely destroy all the wildlife that lives in the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4389	1	The Delta is a critical habitat for wildlife. Its depletion will have a terrible impact on migratory fish and birds, which in turn will have consequences around the world. Southern California needs to find a way to cut their water use to sustainable levels, instead of taking it away from other people and animals!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Chapter 11 (Aquatic Resources) and Chapter 12 (Terrestrial Resources) discuss impacts to fish species and wildlife, as well as mitigation for these impacts. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
4390	1	Nobody is entitled to take another area's natural resources.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4391	1	I grew up with the Delta. It reminds me of the song "Old Man River". This is a part of the habitat of the San Francisco Bay Area. Even though it's not a national park waterway, it should be.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4392	1	I care about our state's natural ecosystems!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4393	1	It's a complete waste of our taxpayers' money. Build a damn desalination plant and have endless water.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
4394	1	I have been enjoying the Delta for over 44 years. It's a uniquely special place. Water-skiing and fishing are two important reasons to protect our Delta. Hands off.	On-water recreation such as fishing and boating would still be accessible throughout the Delta during and after construction of the proposed project.
4395	1	Leave the water alone. Shut down the water parks or something else.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4396	1	I don't want to see our Delta wildlife hurt by human unsustainability.	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.
4397	1	[The WaterFix] will ruin the ecology and affect the Valley's agriculture!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water) and Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation).
4398	1	Save the Delta environment and protect our resources.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4399	1	I want to preserve the Delta for the agriculture that feeds the country.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. In its efforts to achieve the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration, the California WaterFix seeks to protect dozens of species of fish and wildlife in the Delta while also securing reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California. Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed California WaterFix.
4400	1	This is not a smart idea. I cannot believe our governor is really trying to push this through.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4401	1	Stop killing our ecosystems.	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.
4402	1	These tunnels are not logical they would ruin our Delta. You would have to be a lunatic to endorse something like this initiative.	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).
4403	1	It will destroy the Delta, the fishing, the local farmers! It will only help the corporate farmers who send their produce overseas and the Southern California residents who waste the water down the streets!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Therefore, this project is not the result of "favoring" large corporations (e.g., large agribusinesses). In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply) and Master Response 26 (The Delta as A Place).
4404	1	I am passionate bass angler that participates in catch-and-release. I love fishing the Delta, as it ranks in the nation's top 10 for bass fisheries. Any more water taken from this estuary could be detrimental to not only the estuary itself, but also the economy that the small cities around the Delta get from all the tournament anglers and seasonal anglers that visit.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required. Please refer to Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, for a discussion of impacts to tourism and local economies.
4405	1	I've lived by the Delta most of my life. We need to preserve this beautiful and vital waterway for future generations.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. For more information regarding Delta as a Place please see Master Response 24.
4406	1	Fisheries and watersheds are to be protected before any residential and agricultural water solutions are proposed.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4407	1	The tunnels will kill our Delta and devastate our fisheries.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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).
4408	1	I live on the Sacramento River. We must preserve our environment and this rare asset. This project is unconscionable and a waste of funds.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
4409	1	We need to protect the Delta environment and Delta farming. Southern California has already dried up Owens Lake! Find another source for Southern California's water needs!	<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> <p>Regulatory laws and conditions are much different today, and they make it impossible for one region to take advantage of another to such a degree. Under the stringent environmental statutes in place today, including the Endangered Species Act, operation of the proposed water delivery system could not drain the Delta rivers and channels dry, including the Sacramento River. The proposed project's facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants, would be operated in accordance with permits issued by, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the State Water Resources Control Board, among other agencies. The proposed project would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 24 (The Delta As a Place), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).</p>
4410	1	We are being sold out for greed by our state officials who do not listen to their constituents. They are not listening to common sense approaches to resolve the water issues	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.
4411	1	We need to protect our ecosystem.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4412	1	We've done enough damage to the earth and to marine life. Let it go. Leave it be. Instead, let's produce a project that will eliminate pollution.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
4413	1	My boat is on the Delta in Stockton, California and I don't want the Delta to change.	The overall recreation experience for boaters in the vicinity of intake construction areas would be reduced during construction activities, because of the elevated noise levels as well as visual setting disruptions. These temporary construction-related effects would last for up to 5 years in the vicinity of intake and barge unloading facilities. Chapter 15 of the Draft EIR/EIS and of Appendix A (Chapter 15) of the RDEIR/SDEIS describe potential impacts to on-water recreation. Mitigation would reduce impacts on marine navigation by developing and implementing site-specific construction traffic management plans; installing visual barriers between construction work areas and sensitive receptors; applying aesthetic design treatments to all structures; and employing noise-reducing construction practices.
4414	1	I oppose Delta tunneling greatly. And want my [comment] to be considered and counted with the many others who care to help save Delta waterways for future generations.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
4415	1	I grew up in the Delta. California leadership has never looked towards the future, only their bank accounts. Hoping they will realize this is huge mistake that will raise taxes on an already over-taxed state.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4416	1	No, no, no! [The WaterFix] doesn't fix anything.	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.
4417	1	These tunnels are a detriment to the environment and a financial burden to the citizens of California.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4418	1	We live here! You can't keep destroying our environment!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).
4419	1	I believe these proposed tunnels will destroy the Delta environment. There are other solutions for the southern part of the state that don't involve our destruction.	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), Master Response 6 (Demand Management), Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place) and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
4420	1	This drought is causing saltwater intrusion to move farther up our rivers every day, I know, I see it.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
4420	2	I honestly do not feel anyone has any idea what irreversible damage it will cause to our Delta if 30% more fresh water is taken from it! I hope my children don't have to look back and say, "I remember before, when the Delta was alive. It wasn't an overgrown,	By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The proposed project does not increase the amount of

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		lifeless, salt marsh, and there was fresh water we used to swim in there, catch fish with our dad. What a waste, and why? It was for nothing but greed, pure greed!" Mankind's fate, selfish greed, never caring about cause and effect to even their own children. Who are these people who have no soul, no pride, no respect, no responsibility? These are the ones who should be brought to trial for what they have already done, likewise what they continue to do! Please tell me I am wrong, and this is not happening.	water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports). Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place) and Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
4421	1	I oppose the tunnels. Take the money and build a desalination plant! Northern California Delta will be heavily impacted by taking the fresh water and allowing salt water into the area.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
4422	1	I have lived on the Delta at Tower Park for 25 years and love every bit of it and the people here are the best friends you'll ever know. The tunnels can't make me move.	Tower Park Marina would be more than 2,600 feet from the nearest project features, a reusable tunnel material area on Bouldin Island. The EIR/S used a distance of 1,200 to 1,400 feet for noise and visual impacts, so Tower Park Marina would not be anticipated to experience direct impacts from the project. Additionally, Tower Park residents would not be required to move.
4423	1	Find another way to supply the rest of the state with water! Leave Northern California water alone! Bad enough sending water south! They do not conserve water -- they are sucking us dry!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Refer to Master Response 6 (Demand Management), Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply), and Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports).
4424	1	Northern California has a right to its own water.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
4425	1	The BDCP/California WaterFix will kill [the] Delta and the San Francisco Bay so some greedy corporate farmers can have water, while our wildlife get none and Northern Californians get none.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Therefore, this project is not the result of "favoring" large corporations (e.g., large agribusinesses). In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
4426	1	Northern California is becoming a desert because of all the water that is being sent to the south. The tunnels will destroy an entire ecosystem. Build desalination stations along the coast. The Pacific Ocean is an immense resource.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
4427	1	I believe the tunnels will be a detriment to the area.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
4428	1	I grew up on the Delta, spent many days/nights there with family and friends. It's needed for so many livelihoods; the people on the Delta don't have much to survive off of and eliminating the water is essentially eliminating them and the many generations that follow. This is not a solution.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
4429	1	I am tired of our government sending the Delta water to other places. We have more use [for] it since we farm and this farming feeds millions of people nationwide! Stop Jerry Brown!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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 26 (Changes in Delta Exports) and Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation).
4430	1	[The WaterFix] is a complete waste of money. This is just a big money grab for the Southern California water districts who can't manage their own problems -- they just keep building and building and by paying off a few people they can just take it from somebody else.	The comment raises an import policy issue concerning sustainable growth in California. However, the comment does not question the growth inducement analysis or conclusions of Chapter 30. No additional response is needed.
4431	1	If these tunnels go in they will dramatically impact the Delta's ecosystem.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous 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. Project related impacts are disclosed in individual resource area chapters in the EIR/EIS. All impacts would be minimized and mitigated to the degree feasible, as noted under each alternative in the EIR/EIS individual resource chapters and in Appendix 3B (Environmental Commitments) of the EIR/EIS.
4432	1	[The WaterFix is] too costly, at this time, and we don't even have enough water to take care of ourselves at this time.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project, and Master Response 38 regarding costs and implementation. For more information regarding funding sources please see Master Response 5.
4433	1	The future of the Delta belongs to our valley's children, not big agriculture or any other entity not invested in our city/county/region's best interest.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
4434	1	We do not need another big engineering water project. We need some social engineering to use water wisely and in harmony with nature.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Appendix 1C of the Final EIR/EIS, Demand Management Measures, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. 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.
4435	1	I believe this plan will destroy the California Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4436	1	The Tunnels will destroy the Delta and agricultural farmlands.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 24 (The Delta As A Place) and Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation).
4437	1	The "Twin Tunnels" are the biggest boondoggle in California water history.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
4438	1	This is the worst thing they can do to the Delta. Don't the government officials have any sense, or are they just puppets for the money-grabbers? I thought this was settled the last time we voted against the canal. How many times do we have to tell them no by our vote?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4439	1	Nature has done a great job with the Delta. Let us not harm it!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4440	1	Northern/Central California is vital and productive, too. We need our own water! Lots of us are citing Democrats, too, not just GOP. I want to continue to be proud of the Democratic Party. Help us!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4441	1	I'm opposed to destroying the Delta. What we need is rain.	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.
4442	1	I am a farmer [and] do not want our water exported south. Let's build some storage, not just shuffle what water we have around.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. For information regarding why water storage was not included in the proposed project, refer to Master Response 37 (Water Storage) and Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.
4443	1	The Delta tunnels need to be stopped. Agriculture in the Central Valley of California is more important than green lawns in Beverly Hills!	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.
4444	1	This insidious plan is far-fetched. I have fished the rivers and Delta for over 30 years. Shame on you, Jerry Brown.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4445	1	The state pulled out the only reason to support this project: funding for the much-needed restoration projects that would improve the ecosystem in the Delta and upstream. Now it is a hollow, water-robbing shell.	<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>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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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>Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Overview of Restoration and Enhancement Activities).</p>
4446	1	I believe this project isn't environmentally sound or cost-effective. Spend that time and money on water desalination plants and well/dam projects instead.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
4447	1	I live here on this beautiful place called the Delta! We love it here and do not want our ecosystem ruined!	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.
4448	1	I don't agree with destroying the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4449	1	The tunnels are the wrong solution.	Please refer to Master Response 4 (Tunnel Option), which addresses why the tunnel option was the only alternative optimized.
4450	1	The Delta Tunnels do not solve anything. They would create bigger problems by devastating the ecology of our beautiful region.	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.
4451	1	I oppose the tunnels; [they] will not solve the problem.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
4452	1	This is our water to sustain the Delta. The first Governor Brown took our water through the Delta-Mendota and California Aqueduct. Please don't let this happen again. This is our home.	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.
4453	1	I live on the Delta and don't want it destroyed by these tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4454	1	I live in the Delta! No tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4455	1	The San Francisco Bay-Delta is a rare ecological treasure, and these tunnels would destroy it beyond repair. We have an ethical and moral responsibility to protect this	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		rare, beautiful, and ecologically rich area.	Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (The Delta As A Place).
4456	1	The Delta and San Francisco Bay are struggling as it is. You don't need to mess it up with some harebrained idea that will steal people's homes, waste tax money and benefit no one. Use sense and fix the problems that exist. (Can you say Oakland Bay Bridge?)	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. The preferred alternative, 4A, would displace 17 residential structures. When required, the project proponents would provide compensation to property owners for losses due to implementation of the alternative. Please also refer to Master Response 5 regarding costs and funding.
4457	1	Keep the water in the Delta where it belongs. Why should I, the taxpayer, pay for this?	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Refer to Master Response 5 (Funding).
4458	1	I do not want to see our Delta destroyed.	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.
4459	1	I don't want the destruction of a crucial part of our state's ecology.	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.
4460	1	I oppose this project. It will destroy a wetlands Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4461	1	I don't feel this [WaterFix project] is a solution to our issue at this time.	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.
4462	1	We don't need tunnels, we need better water management in California. California needs above-ground projects from water sources that are not so destructive to the Delta or any environment. Stop the crony capitalism, Jerry Brown. This [is] just like his crazy train! Follow the money.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.
4463	1	In these dire times of water shortage, this is a short-sighted proposition that does not protect the Bay Area. We cannot afford to divert any more water or pollute the water we 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. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts.
4464	1	These tunnels will destroy Northern California and displace millions of people.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).
4465	1	Legislature is scapegoating the real problem. Selling most of the fresh water is the real problem. Stop the aqueduct and nut farmers first!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4466	1	The tunnel project will be [a] terrible environmental disaster for the California Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4467	1	[The] tunnel makes no sense.	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.
4468	1	We need the Delta to stay here and stay alive!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4469	1	Please do not ruin our Delta by allowing these tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4470	1	I am concerned about our water supply and the environmental impact [of] this project.	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.
4471	1	This a water grab by the mega-farmers in the Bakersfield area and the rich, politically influential folks in Los Angeles. It makes no sense for the Delta and its declining economy system. It [is] the power of big money over doing what is right for the Delta and the folks that rely on it.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Therefore, this project is not the result of "favoring" the rich or politically influential. 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 26 (Change in Delta Exports), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
4472	1	The tunnel system will damage the Delta system and further endanger fish and wildlife.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4473	1	Put it up for a vote, Northern California only.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4474	1	I am against fracking and we need to save our water.	<p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows. Fracking - or "hydraulic fracturing" -- presumably could be an "industrial" use of water, and is a lawful use of water. Pursuant to Senate Bill 4 from 2013 (Stats. 2013, Ch.313), moreover, the state Department of Conservation, through its Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR), is currently working on fracking regulations. Please see Master Response 34 for additional information regarding use of water delivered by proposed water conveyance facilities.</p> <p>One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board.</p> <p>The proposed project Lead Agencies have no power to impose penalties on individual water users. DWR and Reclamation have contracts with various entities, some of which sell water to water retailers, who have individual policies and programs to motivate ratepayers to conserve water. Different districts have the right to take different approaches depending on their individual circumstances.</p>
4475	1	This [WaterFix project] doesn't solve the problem. We need more water storage and this will destroy the Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. For information regarding why water storage was not included in the proposed project, refer to Master Response 37 (Water Storage) and Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 24 for details on the Delta as a place and the impacts of the proposed project on the Delta.
4476	1	I do not want to see the Delta destroyed like Owens Valley, Mono Lake, and every other water grab project has done.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Regulatory laws and conditions are much different today, and they make it impossible for one region to take advantage of another to such a degree. Under the stringent environmental statutes in place today, including the Endangered Species Act, operation of the proposed water delivery system could not drain the Delta rivers and channels dry, including the Sacramento River. The proposed project's facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants, would be operated in accordance with permits issued by, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the State Water Resources Control Board, among other agencies. The proposed project would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4477	1	This politically motivated engineering project will undermine the fragile, environmentally unique inland Delta as well as remove more land from agriculture. It is an unmitigated environmental travesty. I like Governor Brown but he is wrong on this issue. We don't have the engineering capability to ensure that it will be done correctly -- just look at the Bay Bridge and the problems with the bolts as an example. We need to restore the Delta, not destroy it.	<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 ecological problems with the current system could be greatly reduced by the construction and use of new north Delta intake structures with state-of-the-art fish screens. With this future vision in mind, DWR and several state and federal water contractors, in coordination with Reclamation, have coordinated since 2006 to design alternatives that would restore ecological functions in the Delta while improving water supply reliability in California. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria 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 31 and 24 (Delta As a Place) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p> <p>Appendix 3F of the RDEIR/S provides details on the development of intakes and fish screening technology, as well as the Conceptual Engineering Reports (CERs).</p>
4478	1	I believe that this [WaterFix project] would kill the Delta habitat. This is a diverse and exceptional area that needs to be protected. Every year, the Delta is becoming more and more saline.	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. Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the EIR/EIS discloses the potential water quality impacts resulting from constructing and operating the proposed project. See also Master Response 14 (Water Quality).
4479	1	We want to keep the Delta a natural habitat for the wildlife that has lived there forever.	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.
4480	1	We need fresh water!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4481	1	The Delta is low on water already. We need every drop.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4482	1	No need to ruin the California Delta for the greed of people!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4483	1	I love the Delta and don't want it to be destroyed.	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.
4484	1	I work at a water treatment plant and that water is much-needed in our own area.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4485	1	[The WaterFix is] going to destroy the Delta fisheries and the recreational waters.	On-water recreation such as fishing and boating would still be accessible throughout the Delta during and after construction of the proposed project. Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need.
4486	1	The tunnels will ruin the Sacramento/San Joaquin/San Francisco Bay-Delta ecosystem and do irreparable harm to the local Delta economy for the primary benefit of a small group of beneficiaries (e.g., corporate welfare queens like the Resnicks, Big Oil frackers like Chevron and sleazy water purveyors like Westlands [Water District]) who privately profit from subsidized public water. The public will be stuck with an enormous long-term	<p>The comment relates to adverse effects on the Delta ecosystem and economy, project funding, who would benefit from the project, and a vote on the project.</p> <p>With respect to voting, please see Master Response 72 for more information on the process to select the</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		bill (\$60 billion or more) without any real change in the overall water supply, yet the public has not been given the opportunity to vote on the project (perhaps because the proponents recall all too well that the public soundly rejected the Peripheral Canal referendum).	<p>alternative to be implemented.</p> <p>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the Clean Water Act and federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria 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>More than two-thirds of the residents of the state and more than two million acres of highly productive farm land receive water exported from the Delta watershed. The proposed project aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. 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 and who would pass those costs on to the water recipients through changes in fees. Please see Master Response 38 for more information regarding costs of implementing the proposed project and Master Response 39 for information regarding funding of the proposed project. For more information on project funding, please see Master Response 39.</p> <p>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. They would maintain fishing and other recreation access during construction, enhance fishing access beyond construction, incorporate recreation access into intake design at the Sacramento River, and implement other measures to reduce construction effects on recreation quality.</p>
4487	1	The loss of fish species is not acceptable.	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.
4488	1	We need reservoirs, not tunnels to favor the almond growers and Southern California.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. For information regarding why water storage was not included in the proposed project, refer to Master Response 37 (Water Storage) and Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 34 for additional details on the determination of beneficial use.
4489	1	Our water solutions need to be with the ecology first in mind; as humans, we must tailor our actions to the needs of the earth. Our attention needs to go to changing our water requirements by farmers; investing in decentralized water catchment and storage; stopping our ridiculous practices of sending stormwater out to the ocean; building in water reuse, cisterns, and greywater systems throughout the state. We are a dry state; we need to face reality and build our lifestyles around this fact, not live a pipe dream of lush, green ridiculous lawns and pools that make a mockery of our water future. Rebuild the water table, etc. Invasive projects like the tunnel are a waste of money and further devastating to the land.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.
4490	1	This project is bad for all Californians.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4491	1	Northern California water supply is too erratic. Supplying water in flood years doesn't help in drought years. Supplying water in flood years creates dependency on the water that can't be sustained in drought years. Don't create even more dependencies.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Water delivered to the SWP and CVP water contractors participating in proposed project would be within the existing contract amounts to serve agricultural lands that have been cultivated and existing and planned community populations. As described in Chapter 5, Water Supply, of the EIR/S, it is anticipated that climate

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>change would result in more frequent and more severe rainfall events and less snowfall than under historic conditions. These rainfall events would result in periods of time when the capacity of the existing intakes would not be adequate. Therefore, the proposed project would provide the maximum capacity in the intakes and tunnels during those periods of time to convey water during extremely wet periods to areas south of the Delta for storage and use during drier times. The proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase flows in the wet winter months when the river flows are high to improve conditions for aquatic resources. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries in drier periods.</p> <p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <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>
4492	1	The tunnels are an expensive, devastating plan which will permanently damage the Northern California landscape and economy.	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.
4493	1	I live in the beautiful California Delta and do not want it to be destroyed!	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.
4494	1	The California Delta is one of the most beautiful places in California. It is home to a variety of wildlife. Please do not take away this home to many humans and creatures alike. There must be other solutions.	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.
4495	1	I want to stop the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4496	1	Stop the Delta tunnels. All the experts agree it will harm the Delta. The High Speed Railway and now this?	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4497	1	I think the idea of these massive tunnels is just wrong. There are alternatives. My son-in-law farms in the Delta. His family has farmed in the Stockton area since the 1920s. Due to the current drought, salinity is already becoming a problem. I believe the tunnels will only make it worse. What a shame it would be to ruin the largest freshwater estuary on the Pacific Coast. The "farmers" that are requesting this water are growing crops that are unsustainable in the desert areas they are using. I urge you to find another solution.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS.
4498	1	This pursuit is a travesty to our state. Stop this madness.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4499	1	I kiteboard, fish and live for the Delta.	On-water would still be accessible throughout the Delta during and after construction of the proposed project.
4500	1	Water cannot and should not be bought. No one should have water rights. Who is going to speak for the water? Protect our natural resources!	The State Water Resources Control Board, not DWR, is responsible for decisions relating to water rights. DWR holds water rights approved by the State Water Resources Control Board but does not have the power or authority to issue water rights to others. Additionally, 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.
4501	1	The tunnel plan is the height of stupidity, short-sighted hubris. We should stabilize our population and cease urban development. There will never be enough water to satiate the thirst of the horrible mess in the desert: Southern California.	The comment raises import policy issues concerning sustainable growth, water supplies in California. However, the comment does not question the growth inducement analysis or conclusions of Chapter 30. No additional response is needed.
4502	1	I want to preserve the Delta and put my taxes towards fixing the water systems we already have in place and make them efficient.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need, Master Response 5 on project funding, and Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management.
4503	1	The tunnels will be a disaster for what is a beautiful ecosystem that took eons to develop. It is a shame in today's world where everyone is so concerned about the environment until it is self-serving. Then, all of a sudden, to hell with the environment. Sad deal!	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.
4504	1	I am concerned about the future of our waterways and water quality.	Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the EIR/EIS discloses the potential water quality impacts resulting from constructing and operating the proposed project. See also Master Response 14 (Water Quality).
4505	1	The Delta is a fragile ecosystem that will not survive if tunnels are constructed!	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.
4506	1	I want to save our Delta, not destroy it.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4507	1	We need to preserve the Delta region.	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.
4508	1	I am signing because my entire family lives up there and you do not believe redistributing the water is the answer. I think this has to do with greed and politics.	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.
4509	1	Because we do not want the delta to die!	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.
4510	1	Tunnels are going to ruin the Delta and they are not a long term fix. Financial charges for water rights and desalinization are the keys to a long term solution.	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. The State Water Resources Control Board, not DWR, is responsible for decisions relating to water rights. See Master Response 7 (Desalination).
4511	1	Special interest greed cannot and should not be subsidized by tax payers.	DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.
4512	1	This [WaterFix] plan doesn't make sense from economic, environmental, or public health points of view. Although it does have a big economic stimulus for its proponents, not for the public.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Refer to Chapter 25 of the EIR/EIS for impacts to public health and related mitigation. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding).
4513	1	The tunnels would destroy my spiritual home. I go there to repair my soul from the insanity of our civilization.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Refer to Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).
4514	1	Because I feel the tunnels serve no purpose in California's conservation of water.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Please see Master Response 3 for discussion regarding the purpose and need for the proposed project.
4515	1	I'm signing because I very much enjoy the Delta and think the money should be spent on desalination plants instead which would actually produce more fresh water, not just	The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of a particular water supply augmentation approach

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		attempt to redistribute what little we have. The tunnels will only benefit the big Ag companies and why Dictator Brown is trying so hard to push them through.	<p>(desalination) and does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives (such as desalination) that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project. However, nothing in the proposed project would prevent other entities from pursuing innovative approaches to desalination or other water supply solutions. As described in Appendix 3A, Section 3A.7, Results of Initial Screening of Conveyance Alternatives, EIR/EIS (2013), desalination was included as part of Alternative B7. Issues related to desalination include land use impacts, costs, and substantial energy use requirements. Advances in technology have improved feasibility of desalination and as a statewide water use planning component; it will be evaluated by water agencies on a local/regional level.</p> <p>Desalination, the process of removing salt and other minerals from seawater to make it suitable for drinking or irrigation, is being implemented in several California communities. However, it has not proven viable to secure adequate water supplies to meet California's needs due to high costs and energy demands.</p> <p>Today, desalination creates an estimated 84,000 acre-feet of potable water a year in the state, mostly through treatment of brackish groundwater, which is less salty and cheaper to treat than sea water. In comparison, the proposed project would secure an estimated 4.7 to 5.2 million acre-feet of water to supply more than 25 million people and 3 million acres of farmland.</p> <p>Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Local water agencies will need to invest in additional strategies and technologies, including desalination, to meet future water demand.</p> <p>The proposed project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies needed to meet California's overall water management needs. It is not a substitute for increased commitments to other water supply solutions, including recycling, desalination, water conservation and storage.</p> <p>Please also see Master Response 7 regarding desalination.</p>
4516	1	Opposed because of the devastation to the environment that it would cause	<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>
4517	1	The issue is mismanagement in the creation of paper water. Our trusted servants are making irreversible decisions effecting precious natural resources.	<p>Please note that the project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole. Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on 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 plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Although the project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives), Master Response 31 (Delta Reform Act), and Master</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
4518	1	I live in the Delta and care about our region.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4519	1	I'm signing because the Delta is already in a fragile state. Good water and water levels are essential to sustaining and improving the condition of the Delta. Putting in destructive tunnels and shipping more water out of the Delta will not in any way help to repair the Delta. As stated in this letter, there are much more cost effective ways to deal with our water needs than taking more water from the Delta!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports), Master Response 4 (Alternatives) and Master Response 6 (Demand Management).
4520	1	I strongly oppose the destruction of the fisheries in the Bay Delta estuary system.	The commenter does not offer any evidence on how the project would result in Bay Delta ecosystem impacts related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4521	1	I do not want to see the Delta community destroyed.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4522	1	Save the Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4523	1	This project is a swindle. It is a snow-job preying on people's fear and ignorance of the real issues. This is the wrong direction! We need real solutions, not corporate deceptions!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3.
4524	1	California as a state itself hardly has enough water already. If you look back in history, every successful city was by a natural running water supply. So why would we have the majority of our population living in a desert? Second, why don't we build tunnels connecting the East Coast with the West Coast instead? States with floods and an excess amount of water that would be dumped into the ocean could be tunneled to other states in a drought. It's a win-win for everyone. The flooding state has less property damage and the state in need of water is no longer in dispute with cutting water off to the farmers and shorting this land from food. Also why grow plants that need the most water in a state with the least amount of it?	<p>Construction of tunnels from the east to west coasts is beyond the scope of the proposed project. Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</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.</p>
4525	1	I want the health of the delta preserved for perpetuity.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4526	1	This is a bad plan drafted by greedy corporate interests in Southern California. It will destroy the ecosystem of the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Therefore, this project is not the result of “favoring” corporations. 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 26 (Change in Delta Exports), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
4527	1	It is necessary for the Delta and those farmers and all of northern California to be able to survive to not build those tunnels and take out water south.	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.
4528	1	This plan for the tunnels, from what I read, seems altogether devastating to the environment.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4529	1	Diverting our Delta water will affect not only our northern California water supply, it will have a tremendous economic and environmental impact on northern California. Diverting northern California’s water is not the answer to southern California’s water issues!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. 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 26 (Change in Delta Exports), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
4530	1	The tunnels are the peripheral canal 2015. We voted overwhelming no then and still say no to a project we do not need, want or can afford. No no no.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
4531	1	The tunnels will ruin the ecosystem of the Sacramento Delta. Let southern California get water from the Colorado River.	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.
4532	1	The Delta is our unique and precious natural water conservation system. It works perfectly the way Nature designed it. This tunnel proposal is expensive, destructive, and unneeded. The Delta ecosystem is fragile and essential to all other ecosystems; all is interconnected.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for discussion regarding the purpose and need for the proposed project and Master Response 5 (Costs and Funding).
4533	1	I want to do anything I can to save our beautiful Delta, the fish, and our lifestyle. Jerry Brown doesn't care about Northern California. Leave our Delta alone!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4534	1	The Delta is the most unique habitat on the West Coast of North America! You can easily destroy it but it can never be recreated!	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.
4535	1	Just stop it, any idiot even knows that desalination is how future water should be done for low water resource areas. Jerry Brown moonbeam drop this crap. My hometown is on the delta and over the years I have seen how far up the sea and river combine has progressed.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
4536	1	These tunnels will decimate my hometown and family farm.	As required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses associated with implementation of the proposed project. Refer to Master Response 24 for information on the Delta As A Place.
4537	1	I want to save our greatest natural resource . . .water!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4539	1	I am a long time resident of San Joaquin County. I am against the tunnels! This is my home please stop the Delta tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4540	1	The Delta is a beautiful place and deserves to be preserved for future generations to enjoy rather than be sacrificed as only a temporary solution to the water needs of the mega growers and Los Angeles.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4541	1	I care about supporting an existing healthy environment and don't believe it should be wrecked to support unsustainable living.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4542	1	Save our fishery.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4543	1	Can't improve the health of the Delta by pumping the water out of it! It needs fresh water flows to keep the saltwater out of it to protect our Delta farms plus our drinking water and our fisheries. Jerry Brown sucks!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Refer to Master Response 14 (Salinity), Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Conservation Measure 1 as a CM).
4544	1	I'm signing because I don't like the idea of taking private lands away, destruction of the ecology of the delta and further taking of water for the southern part of California. We should invest the money in desalination projects instead.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 63. Please see Master Response 51 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
4545	1	I care for California's ecosystem and fisheries.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4546	1	Because I believe the tunnels will destroy the ecosystem in Delta. Keep our fresh water here!	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.
4547	1	I have a boat on the Delta and want to preserve that wonderful waterway.	The overall recreation experience for boaters in the vicinity of intake construction areas would be reduced during construction activities, because of the elevated noise levels as well as visual setting disruptions. These temporary construction-related effects would last for up to 5 years in the vicinity of intake and barge unloading facilities. Chapter 15 of the Draft EIR/EIS and of Appendix A (Chapter 15) of the RDEIR/SDEIS describe potential impacts to on-water recreation. Mitigation would reduce impacts on marine navigation by developing and implementing site-specific construction traffic management plans; installing visual barriers between construction work areas and sensitive receptors; applying aesthetic design treatments to all structures; and employing noise-reducing construction practices.
4548	1	The Delta is our home, our livelihood, and our way of life and diverting it would be devastating to us.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).
4549	1	It breaks my heart the thought of the Governor destroying something as beautiful and important as the Delta. I live here. The pear orchard that surrounds my home has been in the family since the 1850s. The Delta provides food, the governor eats, jobs, and so much more. Don't destroy our Delta, Governor.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).
4550	1	We need to keep our water here	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4551	1	Sending water south while there isn't enough to maintain the bay seems a bad idea, Jet alone spending this much money to do it.	As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months and in drier years; and increase exports in the wet winter months in wetter years when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods. As shown in Appendix 5A, Section C, Delta outflow would be similar under the proposed project as compared to the No Action Alternative. Please refer to Master Response 5.
4552	1	Why send this water south, where there is no drain - to ruin their soil and water - while losing the richest farmland in California, the Delta, once called the Serengeti of the West. What the heck? Does Northern California look like it	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Refer to Master Response 26 (Change in Delta Exports).

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		has water to spare? We are down to 5% of our fog days. We are putting in desert landscaping, and we are in the heaviest drought in history. Please stop the tunnels. Please restore common sense. Please restore our faith in government.	
4552	2	Now could be the time for banning fracking, with its incredible water waste, for changing regulations to allow use of grey water and advanced composting toilets.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4552	3	Whatever happened to Governor Moonbeam? We want back a governor of the people again, not a servant of industrial ag and big business. Your legacy will be the destruction of our fisheries. Your legacy will be turning California into a desert.	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.
4553	1	I'm opposed to the destruction of Northern California resources and water tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. 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.
4554	1	It's time we brought some intelligence to the water table. Grow almonds and rice where there is a surplus of water Not in the deserts	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.
4555	1	I care about our environment and the future for our children.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4556	1	Not good for the environment, exporting more water is not the answer.	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. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years.
4557	1	Governor Brown has been bought and sold by southern California billionaires. This is why, as a Democrat, I voted against him last election. The tunnels would simply destroy the Delta and northern California. I don't know who bought him, but he cannot get his way.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4558	1	I live on the Trinity River and we cannot afford to give anymore water away! Our fish are dying along with our wildlife! We survive on this water to drink and to live. Our Native American neighbors cannot survive without this water and the fish that sustain their lives. This is not recreational! This is survival! Stop the theft of our natural resources! We respect our land, others should as well, instead of raping the land for profit and personal gain.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
4559	1	I love the Delta and don't want to see it destroyed!	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.
4560	1	I oppose this project.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4561	1	We enjoy the Delta for fishing and recreation.	Fishing and recreation would still be accessible during and after construction of the proposed project.
4562	1	Our water is needed here. Restore the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4563	1	The tunnels are going to destroy a beautiful part of California. Plus it is going to rain a lot this year and everyone will chill out.	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.
4564	1	Stealing water from another area that is already in a severe drought does not do anything good at all. Instead of twin tunnels, and/or a bullet train, is it not time to capture more water for a growing population?	No issues related to the adequacy of the environment impacts in the EIR/S were raised. It is important to note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project. Refer to Master Response 3 (purpose and Need), and Master Response 37 (Storage).
4565	1	We need more water storage and not more misuse of the water we have.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4566	1	I'm thinking of the long-term welfare of the ecosystem, not our ecosystem.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4567	1	The new tunnels will unbalance the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4568	1	I grew up on those rivers and the wildlife and preservation that would be lost is unbelievable. I am an outdoors person who provides for my family and fishing and hunting is one of my favorite hobbies. Also why send water to southern California so they can keep their green lawns, pretty fountains, and pools. We need to preserve our wildlife here and our supply. I can go on and on but this is by far one of the dumbest ideas from Brown. We have lost enough wildlife from all the wineries. We need to preserve and conserve, bottom line!	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).
4569	1	Such harm to the environment and to the economy of so many families is unacceptable.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (Delta as A Place).
4570	1	I am a faith leader and we are called to enjoy and be good stewards of the great creation with which, and within which, we live. Destroying an ecosystem which provides so much support, naturally, to so many other ecosystems and which itself is such a wonderful environment for residence, agriculture, recreation, etc. makes no sense. Quite the opposite – we need to protect the Delta so that it continues to be the wonderful, and supportive, environment it is.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered 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.
4571	1	The Delta is an irreplaceable resource.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4572	1	We must protect our dwindling natural environment. Do not create these tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4573	1	We need to keep our water as organic as possible for our fish!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
4574	1	Save the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4575	1	I live on the Sacramento River. If they go ahead with this, we would have to move, eminent domain because we are smack where one of the intakes would be!	This EIR/EIS does disclose in Chapter 13, Land Use that approximately 76 residential, recreational or other structures would be affected by construction of water conveyance facilities. These affected properties would

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			be purchased by DWR.
4576	1	We are already in drought. We need to preserve not waste. What about the animals that depend on the source as well?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4577	1	We have done enough damage, obviously, or we would not be in this predicament. Let us try doing something positive and progressive. This is not.	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.
4578	1	I oppose the tunnels!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4579	1	I value the Delta fishery as it is today. Please don't destroy it.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. 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).
4580	1	We have to protect our environment.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4581	1	The tunnel is a horrible idea. I wish our government would start listening to the people that live here and not the money down south!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
4582	1	We need to preserve our waterways and our ecosystem. Remember the 100s of dams or was it 1000s of dams we put in? Now we realize what a mistake it was and it's costing \$\$\$\$\$ to remove them, leaving the destruction behind. Leave our waterways alone!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4583	1	I live on the water in the Sacramento Delta. We need to protect our Delta water ways from political decision-makers.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4584	1	This is my home. This is a bad use of so much money.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Refer to Master Response 5 (Funding).
4585	1	I completely oppose the tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4586	1	The Tunnels plan does not sucessfully address issues of ecology, economy, public opinion, or provide a sustainable answer to our immediate and future water distribution needs. Do not do it!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			and Need), Master Response 24 (Delta as A Place), and Master Response 6 (Demand Management).
4587	1	The Tunnel Project is the biggest abuse of democratic principles for private gain I have ever heard of or even imagined.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 3 for information on the purpose and need for the project.
4588	1	I am against anymore taxes and messing with the ecology of the Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 5 (Funding).
4589	1	There absolutely shouldn't be Delta Tunnels!!!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4590	1	I fish the Delta and don't want to see it destroyed.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4591	1	I'm upset with our California politicians with to push this proposal through without public support. Shame on them.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4592	1	Bad decisions where there is no benefit and that will not fix the California drought.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4593	1	I feel [the WaterFix] is the most blatant abuse of political power, without any concern in causing further destruction to an already very fragile ecosystem.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous 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.
4593	2	Economic value does not equate, to the water resources planned to create and especially to its usage source. A high price to pay to send valuable needed local and environmental water south, while leaving behind reduced water flows and warming waters causing harmful contaminants, algae blooms and salinity. It will be a Delta system that we will never want to fish in or have our children swim in ever again! The last I heard, was that our ocean levels are rising and our fresh water levels are depleting. Shouldn't our efforts and costs be toward desalination, rather than further depleting our already fragile fresh water ecosystems!!	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
4594	1	Because most of man made stuff ends up becoming a bigger issue let nature work her self. Like man build homes in middle of nowhere good for work, now those homes need water so man makes something and never thinks it through all the way so nope screw them and stop wasting your only water on dumbness like nuclear power plants and oil.	Please see Master Response 3 for discussion regarding the purpose and need for the proposed project.
4595	1	I fear for the ecological impact. Additionally, the tunnels would make my home uninhabitable along with thousands of other tax paying native Californians who have made the Delta our home.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. For more information regarding impacts to socioeconomics and Delta as a Place please see Chapter 16 of the FEIR/EIS and Master Response 24, respectively.
4596	1	This will destroy the Delta and its ecosystem. Let the south build desalination plants.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4597	1	I agree to the objections and like the counter proposals.	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.
4598	1	The Tunnels will ruin the environment as we know it.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4599	1	I object to this use of resources when what California really needs is to learn to conserve.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4600	1	It would destroy our beautiful delta lands and water ways. People play and fish there on a daily basis.	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. As many mitigation measures, avoidance and minimization measures, and environmental commitments have been incorporated into the proposed project as possible.
4601	1	The thunnels will destroy the ecosystem. Stop this rape of the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4602	1	I'm signing because diverting more water from the Sacramento River means the state will increase unimpaired flows on the Stanislaus, Tuolumne and Merced rivers to make up for it, harming our farmers and devastating our economy. The Twin Tunnels are a terrible idea on many fronts.	<p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Resources Control Board on the Sacramento, river with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The project considered in the EIR/EIS would not affect water operations on the Tuolumne River or water supplies for the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The State Water Resources Control Board, not DWR and Reclamation, is responsible for decisions relating to water rights. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in Delta exports please see Master Response 26.</p> <p>Considerations of adverse impacts to Delta agricultural water users due to implementation of the action alternatives (not climate change, sea level rise, or projected population growth that would have occurred with or without the proposed project) are discussed in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources. Changes in Delta water quality that could affect Delta agricultural water users are discussed in Chapter 8, Water Quality, including changes in bromide, chloride, and electrical conductivity.</p> <p>Socioeconomic conditions under the proposed project and other action alternatives as compared to the Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative are presented in Chapter 16 of the EIR/EIS.</p>
4603	1	The "Water Fix" will destroy the Delta. It creates more problems than anything it "fixes." It is not cost effective. There are better ways to "fix" our water issues that are far less expensive. The fact that Californians are not being allowed to vote on this issue is a disgrace. Shame on you Governor Brown and any elected officials who support this	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		project.	
4604	1	The delta region is known for our ability to be productive growers. It's an area rich in agriculture, and has a strong farming community. If the people were to be not heard and the tunnel project not stopped the Ag/farming that we all benefit from will slowly cease to exist, impacting not only all of us, but the generations of farmers who have worked tirelessly to provide food for each one of our tables! Please stop the tunnels!	The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. In its efforts to achieve the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration, the California WaterFix seeks to protect dozens of species of fish and wildlife in the Delta while also securing reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California. Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed California WaterFix.
4605	1	I love the Delta and I want to see its water protected to ensure the current habitat for wildlife.	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.
4606	1	It should not happen. It will ruin our economy in the Valley to say the least.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. As described in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, under Alternative 4, Impact ECON-1, construction employment is estimated to peak at 2,427 FTE jobs in year 3. Total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) would peak in year 12, at 8,673 FTE jobs. Direct agricultural employment would be reduced by an estimated 16 FTE jobs, while total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) associated with agricultural employment would fall by 57 FTE jobs. Because construction of water conveyance facilities would result in an increase in construction-related employment and labor income, this would be considered a beneficial effect.
4607	1	We need water storage and desalination plants! Not high speed rail and tunnels!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need. Additionally, please refer to Master Response 7 for information on desalination and why it was not included as a project alternative.
4608	1	Because we need to protect our farmers and make sure that the water is not piped south. If we pump too much water, the salt water will come further up the Delta ruining farming on the Delta.	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.
4609	1	There will be less future water, these tunnels do not supply the needed water. This money is better spent managing what little water we will be receiving to the betterment of our citizens.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.
4610	1	I want to preserve the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4611	1	Save Our Delta, save our farm land stop the corruption. We can't eat or drink dirt.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 18, for discussion regarding agriculture impacts and mitigation associated with the proposed project.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4612	1	Spending billions on destroying fish, habitat, and one of California's greatest resources is just plain stupid. Instead the government should be spending that money on building new reservoirs in Central and Southern California to store water.	<p>Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
4613	1	This project represents a misguided attempt at solving the state's water issues. It is simply not sustainable and will exacerbate the current problems afflicting the ecosystem and hydrologic conditions of the Delta.	<p>The proposed project is one component, among many, of the California Water Action Plan. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns while securing reliable water deliveries. The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/.</p> <p>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 analyzed, Master Response 7 regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage. Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project and Master Response 35 regarding southern California water supply.</p>
4613	2	Farmers need to stop growing cash crops that are water intensive and politicians need to stop caving in to agricultural lobbyists. This project is motivated by pure greed.	<p>The comment addresses how water is used and who would benefit from the project.</p> <p>More than two-thirds of the residents of the state and more than two million acres of highly productive farm land receive water exported from the Delta watershed. The proposed project aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. However, the project proponents have no authority to designate what water is used for.</p> <p>One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board.</p> <p>The proposed project Lead Agencies have no power to impose penalties on individual water users. DWR and Reclamation have contracts with various entities, some of which sell water to water retailers, who have individual policies and programs to motivate ratepayers to conserve water. Different districts have the right to take different approaches depending on their individual circumstances.</p>
4614	1	The future of our delicate eco systems depends on our deltas! Save the Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4615	1	This is another Governor Brown ridiculous idea just like the train to nowhere. Save our	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Delta, stop the Tunnels.	
4616	1	Oppose the Delta Tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4617	1	The "California WaterFix" is bad news for the environment, business, farmers, and our state as a whole.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 for more information on the Purpose/Need for the project.
4618	1	Waste of money, added destruction of an ecosystem that's already damaged, salt water intrusion will become even worse, it's unnecessary, and also why pull more water out than we already are if we're not getting any water added to the ecosystem due to this chronic drought.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 14 (Salinity), and Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports).
4619	1	This plan is ill-conceived and a panic band-aid attempt. It potentially destroys the delta and San Francisco Bay. There are other far less expensive and damaging alternatives that have been ignored instead of exhausted. It is a major infrastructure overhaul that should be subject to a vote of the people.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. For more information on the range of alternatives considered, please refer to Master Response 4.
4620	1	I sailboard at Sherman Island in the Delta and would like reasonably clean water!	Sherman Island is more than 7 miles away from the modified pipeline tunnel alignment that would be chosen under the preferred alternative, 4A, and would not be affected. Sherman Island would be affected by temporary construction-related effects under Alternative 9 for up to two years.
4621	1	The tunnels will destroy the Delta, where I live.	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 24 (Delta As A Place).
4622	1	Don't ruin the ecology of the region.	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.
4623	1	This is not a solution but a water grab that will destroy the delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports).
4624	1	Why risk agricultural growth significant homes to wildlife in the delta and safety of Northern California to temporarily fix Southern California? You're willing to jeopardize half of the state to prolong Southern California's water problem that's just going to dig us all into a deeper hole and put northern California in a bigger hole at that wake up.	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 project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 4 (Southern California Water Supply), and Master Response 6 (Demand Management).
4625	1	This project will harm the whole Delta system!	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.
4626	1	The delta will be destroyed. The Westside and Los Angeles need to supply their own water. This is Owen Valley déjà vu.	<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> <p>Regulatory laws and conditions are much different today, and they make it impossible for one region to take advantage of another to such a degree. Under the stringent environmental statutes in place today, including the Endangered Species Act, operation of the proposed water delivery system could not drain the Delta rivers and channels dry, including the Sacramento River. The proposed project's facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants, would be operated in accordance with permits issued by, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the State Water Resources Control Board, among other agencies. The proposed project would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply). .</p>
4627	1	Fresh water conservation is important.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4628	1	Save the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4629	1	My life is on this river and Jerry Brown and his money hungry friends are stealing the peoples' river.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4630	1	I oppose this tunnel. It will ruin our life style and surroundings.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			and Need) and Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).
4631	1	The government doesn't own water, water comes from nature, they have no claim over it.	<p>More than two-thirds of the residents of the state and more than two million acres of highly productive farm land receive water exported from the Delta watershed. The proposed project aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. However, the project proponents have no authority to designate what water is used for.</p> <p>One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board.</p> <p>It should be recognized that there are water rights that have been adjudicated and legally binding.</p>
4632	1	We need to put a stop to these tunnels once and for all. This will devastate life as we know it and Delta wildlife.	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.
4633	1	I live in Stockton, California, born and raised and I believe Governor Brown's "California Water Fix" will do more damage than good, therefore I do not support his project.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4634	1	This would have a negative impact on an already delicate ecosystem.	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.
4635	1	It's a waste.	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.
4636	1	I'm signing because I don't want to see any more harm done to the San Francisco Bay and Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4637	1	I can't and won't support Delta Tunnel projects if pushed forward with insight into how damaged Central California rivers are already. There is clearly no feasible way to relocate water by any additional means, when considering the devastating impact on existing endangered/threatened fish species. Don't move forward with this project. I hope California residents unite to stop this mistake before it happens.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Conservation Measure 1 as a CM).
4638	1	I live in Discovery Bay and these tunnels will our whole being here on the water. We	For more information regarding cost of the proposed project please see Master Response 5. For more

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		swim, fish and boat the Delta.	information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
4638	2	The tunnels will affect the ecosystem of the Delta, make water not healthy for swimming and ultimately decrease the value of my home.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).
4638	3	We need plants in Northern California to convert salt water to drinking water like San Diego. Please do not create a monster of a system here just to send water South.	In the State of California, all water belongs to the people of the state; and water rights are issued as rights to use the water for reasonable and beneficial uses. The proposed project would not affect upstream water rights.
4639	1	So many other options to conserve water, i.e. meat industry has the biggest footprint in every variety of measurable environmental footprints. Less is more.	Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.
4640	1	I live on the Delta. This is a terrible idea.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4641	1	I live in Discovery Bay on the water would have a severe negative impacts on the Delta water. Literally my backyard would warm up, turn green with algae and close to stagnate with the lack of adequate flushing of water from the Sacramento River.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
4641	2	The Twin Tunnels are a giveaway to huge agribusiness. Heaven forbid they be required to conserve with mandatory drip and underground irrigation and actually pay a fair market price for the water they consume. It is a complete farce that the 80% users of water are not required to conserve. Oh, but wait, they do own the legislature and the executive branch!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. It is not the result of "favoring" large corporations (e.g., large agribusinesses). In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 6 (Demand Management), Master Response 26 (Change in Delta Exports), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
4642	1	California voters already voted against this project.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4643	1	I have lived on the Delta for over 30 years and do not want to see it ruined by taking more much needed water.	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. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports).
4644	1	The ecology of the Bay-Delta waterways is irreplaceable and connected to the vitality and balance of more than we currently understand. This kind of a mass destruction of a whole ecosystem is foolish, irresponsible and unacceptable. Time for more imaginative solutions than plunder.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
4645	1	The Delta Tunnels will end up destroying the California Delta system as we know it.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4646	1	I windsurf and fish the Delta and the Bay and am highly concerned about the negative side of the Delta Tunnels development.	<p>Waterways will still be navigable during construction and operation of the proposed project. The proposed project would result in temporary impacts to boaters and on-water recreationists. However, the project includes plans to reduce those impacts as much as possible with implementation of environmental commitments to prepare and implement a water navigation plan and provide notification of construction and maintenance activities in waterways (Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments). Additionally, Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a would reduce impacts on marine navigation by development and implementation of site-specific construction traffic management plans, including specific measures related to management of barges and stipulations to notify the commercial and leisure boating communities of proposed barge operations in the waterways.</p> <p>Barge routes and landing sites will be selected by the construction contractor and will be expected to comply with the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximize continuous waterway access between departure port and shaft site • Maintain minimum waterway width greater than 100 feet (assuming maximum barge width of 50 feet) • Use of existing barge landings where possible • Minimum water depth of 6 feet
4647	1	We need to save the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4648	1	My concerns are about the overall impact of the tunnel project and environmental and recreational impacts in the Delta and San Francisco Bay.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Resource areas are addressed separately under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible. Refer to Chapter 15 (Recreation) of the EIR/EIS for impacts of the project on recreation and mitigation for the impacts.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4649	1	The Delta Tunnels are a terrible idea. My dad used to tell me to use my common sense when I was a kid, and that is what I hope you do. You do not need to have an environmental impact report to see this is one of the worst, most self-serving ideas this century that will cause irreparable damage to the Delta, harming not only animal species but also people.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. 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.
4650	1	This project is an environmental disaster and huge waste of taxpayer dollars.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding).
4651	1	How about spending money on fixing all the old flawed pipes that are leaking thus wasting water throughout California?	The commenter does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.
4652	1	The tunnels will destroy the environment and the economy for much of Northern California. This is a grab for water by Southern California that is not necessary.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The proposed project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports), Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), and Master Response 4 (Southern California Water Supply).
4653	1	I do not want the tunnels. It will be a disaster to the fishing industry.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5. Chapter 11 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect fish. It describes the impacts, both negative and positive, and discusses measures that would be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts and to compensate for significant impacts.
4654	1	The estuary is at risk, we need to protect our natural resources.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4655	1	I do not believe that this is the best solution to this problem.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
4656	1	This must be defeated if our bay is to survive as a healthy system, not a cesspool.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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).
4657	1	As a farmer I see a lot of misuse and waste of water and an alarming loss of the topsoil in the conventional farming practices applied in the San Joaquin Valley. I believe the San Valley is not a desert wasteland that we should throw more water at. Farmers need to lean new sustainable methods of farming and the state as a whole could do way more to conserve water in lieu of diverting water away from an already taxed ecosystem like the Delta. Please educate farmers on sustainable methods of farming instead of wasting what little water we have.	<p>The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of a particular water supply augmentation approach (greater agricultural conservation) and does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the proposed project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>For more information regarding agricultural beneficial water use please see Master Response 34.</p>
4658	1	This is 16 billion dollars that will not prove to be worth the expense. There are other plans, such as desalination that are more effective for less money.	Please see Master Response 7 for a discussion on desalination.
4659	1	I oppose the tunnels, instead desalination plants should be built and more dams and water storage should be built.	<p>The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of a particular water supply augmentation approach (desalination, more storage) and does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the range of alternatives selected.</p> <p>The alternatives included in the Draft EIR/EIS represent a legally adequate reasonable range of alternatives and the scope of the analysis of alternatives fully complies with both CEQA and NEPA. The Lead Agencies carefully considered all potential alternatives that were proposed during the scoping process and during time of preparation of the Draft EIR/EIS.</p> <p>While water storage is a critically important tool for managing California's water resources, it is not a topic that must be addressed in the EIR/EIS for the proposed project. This is because the proposed project does not, and need not, propose storage as a project component. Although the physical facilities contemplated by the proposed project once up and running would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, the proposed project is a stand-alone project for purposes of CEQA and NEPA, just as future storage projects would be. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, of the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage. Please see Master Response 37 regarding water storage.</p>
4660	1	Our water is life! Do not ruin it more than it already is!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4661	1	I live near Stockton and have enjoyed recreational boating (sculling) on the Delta. Spending time on the Delta made me want to stay and invest in the Stockton community. If the tunnels impacted the quality of and/or access to the Delta waterways, I and many others would have little incentive to continue living and investing in these communities. How much is it even fathomable to go ahead with this tunnel plans.	Access to waterways will be maintained throughout and after construction of the proposed project.
4662	1	This is fiscally, environmentally and scientifically irresponsible of the governor to be pushing this.	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>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. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Costs and Funding).</p>
4663	1	I live in this area and I do not think the government should be able to destroy it just because Los Angeles wants our water! Jerry Brown Sr. already took too much.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environment impacts in the EIR/S were raised.
4664	1	Common sense. Leave the water alone. Use the money to clean up our water not [unintelligible] it.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4665	1	Independent analysis shows an environmental disaster to an incredible natural resource. State officials are ramrodding this project through, ignoring facts and public opinion. This project represents is public policy at its worst. Stop the tunnels!	<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. 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. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 40 (Public Outreach Adequacy), Master Response 41 (Transparency), and Master Response 42 (Public Comments).</p>
4666	1	This is an insane project!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4667	1	There is no water to share and, if there were, the cost is too high.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Deliveries to in-Delta senior water rights users are the same under the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and all action alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS in accordance with existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.
4668	1	I oppose these tunnels and Governor Brown's efforts to ram them through. This will destroy northern California and the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4669	1	We are in the Bay Area are tired of supporting southern California with water to support	No issues related to the adequacy of the environment impacts in the EIR/S were raised.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		their lifestyle.	
4670	1	I spend a lot of time doing watersports on the Delta, have for about 40 years. I do not want to see the Delta tunnel.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4671	1	The tunnels would destroy the San Francisco Bay and the wildlife in the northern half of the state.	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.
4672	1	The tunnels will destroy our Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4673	1	I do not want the tunnels. I do not want the Bay and the Delta to be degraded anymore.	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.
4674	1	I want to save the California Delta, one of the most beautiful spots in California. No tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4675	1	Project is plain impractical; and since it does no create water, it does not solve the overall problem. What we need is storage for those rainy days.	<p>Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
4675	2	Sacrificing the Delta should not be an option. The plans as they stand will destroy the Delta; and that price is too great to pay, let alone the amount of money which will be	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		spent in this pork project.	standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding).
4675	3	We all need to remember who was on side when election time comes around and stand against the Tunnels when we cast our ballot. The Tunnels: it is the Governor's peripheral canal in sheep's clothing.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4676	1	As a life-long Sacramentan, I do not believe this is the right approach to Southern California water issues. It will only further destroy our Delta and Bay fragile ecosystems.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns while securing reliable water deliveries. Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.
4677	1	It would be a disastrous outcome for the Delta and the ecosystem if this is allowed to happen. Stop the tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4678	1	Misappropriating water that jeopardizes the ecosystem and native species in the estuary to benefit a few large agriculture companies is absurd. This benefits a few and leaves the locals around the estuary, those who enjoy the fisheries, and taxpayers as loser. Just think about it.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. It is not the result of "favoring" large corporations (e.g., large agribusinesses). In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 5 (Funding) and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
4679	1	I disagree with the tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4680	1	It will destroy the area and it costs too much!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place), and Master Response 5.
4681	1	This is not a fix, nor a solution. Wake up Mister Governor.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4682	1	I want our California Delta preserved. I do not want water diverted to southern California. I do not want the water right near my home to be saltwater. I do not want politicians to ignore our flora and fauna and famers or anyone to lose their land because of imminent domain claims.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 5 (Southern California Water Supply), Master Response 14 (Salinity), and Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation).
4683	1	We need this water.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.
4684	1	I am opposed to the tunnels to ship water to Southern California.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environment impacts in the EIR/S were raised.
4685	1	I do not believe in sending more water to Southern California for irrigation of desert lands at the expense of wrecking the ecosystem of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. It's bad enough that it would do harm to our fish and wildlife in regular rainy years, but in drought years it would be catastrophic.	<p>In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal and State regulating agencies, ESA compliance, and project design. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.</p> <p>Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. 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>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4686	1	I am signing because our Delta has to be saved from the salty sea water. There will be a hard road to reverse the effects of this on the ecosystem. What happens to the farms and cities that get their freshwater from the Delta and the water begins to have salt content? Revise the proposal and realize natural desalination plants in Southern California is the answer; the zip codes there have the money for that. If there is an energy dispute, cover the peripheral canal with solar panels, evaporation.	<p>Salinity in the Delta is a function of the amount and timing of freshwater input from the major tributaries, tidal action from San Francisco Bay, and exports from the Delta. During the late winter and spring months of seasonally elevated flows, and in wet years, seawater intrusion is limited and the Delta has mostly low salinity. During low-flow summer and fall months, and during dry years, lower freshwater flows result in greater amounts of seawater intrusion. Staff from DWR and USBR constantly monitor Delta water quality conditions and adjust operations of the SWP and CVP in real time as necessary to meet water quality objectives set by the State Water Resource Control Board protection of agricultural water supply, municipal and industrial drinking water supply, and fish and wildlife beneficial uses. See section 4.3.4 for a discussion on the proposed projects effects on water quality, salinity and electrical conductivity.</p> <p>Effects of the alternatives on salinity levels are described in Chapter 8, Water Quality, and Appendix 8H, Electrical Conductivity, EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Modeling results indicate that the implementation of the water conveyance facilities may positively or adversely affect in-Delta water quality, depending on a number of factors including location, time of year, and hydrologic conditions. See tables in Appendices 8E through 8N for specific results related to various water quality constituents (including bromide and chloride).</p> <p>In addition to potential effects associated with the project and alternatives, modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the proposed project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.</p> <p>For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.</p>
4687	1	[I want] to help the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4688	1	I grew up on the delta and want my kids to enjoy the same things I did. I believe the tunnels will destroy the fishing and outdoor life we have now.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass, and to Impacts REC-2, 4, 5, and 9 for a discussion of impacts to fishing from the proposed project.
4689	1	I am a regular fisherman and I know the truth to what the tunnels are for and the damage they'll cause. It's all about politician greed who don't care how badly this will damage the ecosystem even after experts have told them so they say they are right and the scientist are wrong. I will not stand for this. This is what is wrong with this country Governor Brown builds a idiotic bullet train when the money could have been spent in a million better uses, such as desalination plants. Or education helping poor communities.	<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. 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. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 5 (Costs and Funding) and Master Response 6 (Demand Management).</p>
4690	1	I'm trying to preserve the San Francisco Bay and Delta. Stop the tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4691	1	We need to save our Delta and help keep the environment healthy for our future generations!	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.
4692	1	Is it not obvious that this would change the entire ecosystem of a huge part of California water ways? And what about our farmers, agriculture and economy in Central California? Get it together and stop trying to take the easy way out.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 18, for discussion regarding agriculture impacts and mitigation associated with the proposed project.
4693	1	It will kill the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4694	1	It is a poor use of funds that is not necessary. Build desalination plants down south.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
4695	1	This is the wrong thing to do. The cost to our Delta habitats, wild life, and tax payers is too much!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding).
4696	1	I don't believe you can take water from a damaged estuary and heal it.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4697	1	I'm signing because this is crazy and needs to be prevented.	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.
4698	1	I live on the water and the water is already extremely green from lack of flow. Taking more water away will even make it worse. Please stop!	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor any change in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high to improve

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			conditions for aquatic resources in the Delta.
4699	1	[I hope] California doesn't make a mistake and ruin the Delta as we know it. The Sacramento River will never be able to sustain the volume of water the tunnels will take out.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>The range of alternatives in the EIR/EIS includes alternatives which result in reductions in SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta as compared to the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative and Alternatives 4H1, 4H2, 4H3, 4H4; 5; 6A, 6B, 6C; 7; 8; and 9 would result in less SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta than under Existing Conditions (shown in Tables 5-5 and 5-8). Similarly, Alternatives 6A, 6B, 6C; 7; 8; and 9 would result in less SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta than under the No Action Alternative (shown in Tables 5-6 and 5-9). However, SWP and CVP water deliveries would continue under all alternatives.</p>
4700	1	California is being ruined. Let us keep this unique space just as it is.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4701	1	Tunneling altering natural rivers in such a way is detrimental to the eco-system.	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.
4702	1	This is not right! Please stop the tunnels!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4703	1	I do not want the tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4704	1	I am a fisherman! Save my fish.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.
4705	1	We need to protect our natural resources!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4706	1	Fresh water is better than salt water to grow crops. It also costs money to build a plant to convert salt water into fresh.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
4707	1	I am signing because I am a 14 year old fisherman, and I would like to stop the Delta tunnels so I can save the fish, and we are in a drought anyways.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			proposed water conveyance facilities” would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.
4708	1	I am a former California resident and fished the Delta most of my life. What Moonbeam Brown wants to do is criminal.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4709	1	I grew up in the Sacramento Delta. It is a unique area of our state, beautiful to behold. Diverting water away from the Delta with this tunnel scheme will be bad for the environment, bad for fish and wildlife, and bad for the citizens who live there or those who travel there for recreation.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4710	1	I live on the Delta, I fish, and want to protect the fragile, diverse ecosystem.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4711	1	I'm signing because the tunnels will cause more damage to the Delta fishing. Which effects my pay check!	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: “Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities” would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: “Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities” would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.
4712	1	I want to save our fish and farms. I have saved water and want what's available to keep the San Francisco Bay and Delta areas as healthy as possible!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4713	1	I don't want to see the Sacramento River and the Delta destroyed.	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.
4714	1	We need to save the Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4715	1	With a drought and tunnels the river will go dry. No to tunnels.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The hydrologic analysis in the EIR/S considered changes over long-term conditions which includes high flow events and drought periods, conditions similar to the 1976-1977 and 1987-1992 droughts, as described in Appendix 5A, Modeling Technical Appendix. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>The range of alternatives in the EIR/EIS includes alternatives which result in reductions in SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta as compared to the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative and Alternatives 4H1, 4H2, 4H3, 4H4; 5; 6A, 6B, 6C; 7; 8; and 9 would result in less SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta than under Existing Conditions (shown in Tables 5-5 and 5-8). Similarly, Alternatives 6A, 6B, 6C; 7; 8; and 9 would result in less SWP and CVP water deliveries south of</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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 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>
4716	1	This is plain wrong; there is nothing positive except for Southern California which has not exercised responsible land use planning and planned accordingly for water use.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4717	1	Don't destroy the ecosystem of the Delta to send water down south. The damage that is done may not be repairable. Time to build more water storage and more storage down south. I was just in Bakersfield and they all have green lawns....how come Northern California is doing their best to conserve but Southern California isn't (or at least parts I've seen)? There are more ways to conserve. Everyone should have to conserve equally! Are there any water storage projects that can be developed in Southern California?	<p>Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.</p> <p>While water storage is a critically important tool for managing California's water resources, it is not a topic that must be addressed in the EIR/EIS for the proposed project. This is because the proposed project does not, and need not, propose storage as a project component. Although the physical facilities contemplated by the proposed project, once up and running, would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, the proposed project is a stand-alone project for purposes of CEQA and NEPA, just as future storage projects would be. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, of the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the development of alternatives. Please see Master Response 6 for information on Demand Management.</p>
4718	1	I live on the Delta. It's my life, my love, my recreation, my peace. My kids, my grandkids all come here. We need to stand and support our water ways.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4719	1	Stop the tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4720	1	I don't want the Delta to be destroyed.	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.
4721	1	I have asthma the air will be unbearable/unbreathable. Please do not dig the earth, pollute the air.	The lead agencies have developed a comprehensive and aggressive mitigation strategy to address air quality and associated human health effects associated with construction emissions (see Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments). The measures outlined in Appendix 3B reflect the latest emissions control strategies based on currently available technologies and will substantially reduce onsite emissions generated during construction. Emissions in excess of local air district thresholds or federal de minimis thresholds will be further mitigated through implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1, AQ-3, and AQ-4.
4722	1	Bad for everyone.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4723	1	I don't want to only fish for salmon and steelhead. Also my orchards need water.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
4724	1	Creating tunnels will destroy the river habitat and drain it of water we cannot afford to lose.	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. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports).
4725	1	I fish the Delta area as often as possible and for quite awhile now. I would hate to see the ecosystem change before my kids can enjoy.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4726	1	Follow the money going to Southern California for no reasons. No conservation efforts for the Delta. Our estuaries, fisheries, keeping the Delta free of salt water and our Northern California drinking water. A bad deal for Northern California.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria 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 6 (Demand Management), Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
4727	1	I care for the Delta been fishing with my parents there for decades and want same for my children.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.
4728	1	I am tired of down south getting more water than they need. All their pools are full and their lawns are green.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.
4729	1	I'm signing because I use these waters regularly. I've grown up loving being on the water and will continue to boat, fish, and enjoy these waters for ever; hopeful my kids do as well	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4730	1	Horrible plan, waste of water and money that will destroy our delta and ecosystem.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			operational flexibility.
4731	1	Preserve our waterways!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4732	1	I believe the tunnels are the wrong answer.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
4733	1	Southern California was historically mostly desert so maybe they should embrace their past. The water needs to stay up north.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.
4734	1	I strongly oppose this.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4735	1	We need our water here in Northern California! We need to protect our waterways, our fish and other wildlife who live and depend on our Delta. We need the enjoyment and jobs created by our boating and recreational industries. The ripple effect will be positive or negative depending on the outcome of this. Stop the tunnels!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the EIR/EIS and effects to recreation are discussed in Chapter 15.
4736	1	I feel that this is s drastic and dangerous option to our water shortage.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The hydrologic analysis in the EIR/S considered changes over long-term conditions which includes high flow events and drought periods, conditions similar to the 1976-1977 and 1987-1992 droughts, as described in Appendix 5A, Modeling Technical Appendix. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>The range of alternatives in the EIR/EIS includes alternatives which result in reductions in SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta as compared to the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative and Alternatives 4H1, 4H2, 4H3, 4H4; 5; 6A, 6B, 6C; 7; 8; and 9 would result in less SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta than under Existing Conditions (shown in Tables 5-5 and 5-8). Similarly, Alternatives 6A, 6B, 6C; 7; 8; and 9 would result in less SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta than under the No Action Alternative (shown in Tables 5-6 and 5-9). However, SWP and CVP water deliveries would continue under all alternatives.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4737	1	We need to preserve the Delta for the future.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4738	1	The tunnels are a bad idea. Build reservoirs down south.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. For information regarding why water storage was not included in the proposed project, refer to Master Response 37 (Water Storage) and Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.
4739	1	Northern California already sends water southward via canals. Draining more water from Northern California affects our farmlands and our wildlife. Stop draining our water!	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>The range of alternatives in the EIR/EIS includes alternatives which result in reductions in SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta as compared to the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative and Alternatives 4H1, 4H2, 4H3, 4H4; 5; 6A, 6B, 6C; 7; 8; and 9 would result in less SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta than under Existing Conditions (shown in Tables 5-5 and 5-8). Similarly, Alternatives 6A, 6B, 6C; 7; 8; and 9 would result in less SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta than under the No Action Alternative (shown in Tables 5-6 and 5-9). However, SWP and CVP water deliveries would continue under all alternatives.</p>
4740	1	I think this would destroy the ecological environment and it is also bad for the economy of the Delta area.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place). Also refer to Chapter 16 (Socioeconomics) of the EIR/EIS.
4741	1	It is just wrong.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4742	1	I oppose the tunnels because of the irreversible damage it would cause to the Chinook runs of Northern California.	The commenter does not offer any evidence on how the project would result in significant fisheries impacts related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4743	1	This proposal is not a fix, it's a water grab. Please propose a fix that focuses on conservation and storage not diversion.	<p>While water storage is a critically important tool for managing California's water resources, it is not a topic that must be addressed in the EIR/EIS for the proposed project. This is because the proposed project does not, and need not, propose storage as a project component. Although the physical facilities contemplated by the proposed project, once up and running, would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, the proposed project is a stand-alone project for purposes of CEQA and NEPA, just as future storage projects would be. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, of the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the development of alternatives. Please see Master Response 6 for information on Demand Management.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4744	1	Native wildlife will be damaged if not ruined for good. The fishery would be changed dramatically for the worse. Tax payers dollars would be in my opinion wasted!	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 wildlife. Both chapters describe the impacts, both negative and positive, and discuss the mitigation measures and avoidance and minimization measures proposed to avoid, minimize, and compensate for any significant impacts.
4745	1	These tunnels make zero economic sense. They would only benefit the Los Angeles area and destroy our beloved Delta.	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. As described in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, under Alternative 4, Impact ECON-1, construction employment is estimated to peak at 2,427 FTE jobs in year 3. Total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) would peak in year 12, at 8,673 FTE jobs. Direct agricultural employment would be reduced by an estimated 16 FTE jobs, while total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) associated with agricultural employment would fall by 57 FTE jobs. Because construction of water conveyance facilities would result in an increase in construction-related employment and labor income, this would be considered a beneficial effect.</p>
4746	1	It is a waste of money. Help feed the poor and homeless, quit wasting taxpayers money.	<p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p>
4747	1	I do not believe the tunnels are a workable solution.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4748	1	Time to stop destroying our Delta's ecosystems.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4749	1	I do not want to see more destruction of the Delta for large businesses.	By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. It is not the result of "favoring" large corporations (e.g., large agribusinesses). In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), and Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
4750	1	Stop tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4751	1	I oppose the tunnels and taking of the Delta water for corporate gain. It's not aware shortage but management issue. The water we have with current infrastructure needs to be better managed for people, crops, and wildlife.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			quality standards.
4752	1	I'm signing because I used to live there, and also have family there. Use the ocean, with desalination farms.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
4753	1	Opposing this is the right thing to do on multiple fronts. We need water desalinization plants rather than taking water from the valley to send elsewhere. Ask Governor Brown to fix his thinking rather than pipe water from the valley.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
4754	1	It's a no brainer! Keep our water here! The Delta is very important to our ecosystem and local communities.	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.
4755	1	The twin tunnels will destroy The Delta, the largest estuary in the United States.	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.
4756	1	I want the tunnels stopped before damage is done!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4757	1	I am against the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4758	1	In Malta they extract water from the sea. Who is interested do the same and pay.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
4759	1	I rely on safe drinking water for my family. The tunnels will degrade my water quality.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
4759	2	I spend a lot of time on the delta fishing and boating. The tunnels will degrade both experiences for me and my family in the future.	On-water recreation such as fishing and boating would still be accessible throughout the Delta during and after construction of the proposed project.
4759	3	If farmers in the south want to grow in the desert, they should fund their own water supply via reverse osmosis sourced from the Pacific Ocean.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
4759	4	Enough of this corporate greed and dirty paid politicians!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4760	1	I stand with the people, the Delta and the salmon.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4761	1	This would devastate the Delta's ecosystem.	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.
4762	1	This is insane and unfair to us!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4763	1	Save the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4764	1	We need to find alternative means of sourcing water to California. This is a drastic measure to fix an issue that will not cure the problem, only to spend millions of dollars and do it all over again in the neat future.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.
4765	1	That water is beautiful, I fish there, I have bbq around there and take my family there there's just no other place I rather relax beside the river. I've been fishing there for about 5 years now not as a sport but to relax and enjoy the view. If it's gone it's going to be tragic.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.
4766	1	I want to protect our fish and waterways. Big Ag should not get our water!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
4767	1	It is wrong to relocate water to a desert community. The community should relocate to the wetland. Relocating the water destroys the ecology on the land left behind.	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 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
4767	2	The Delta economy would be devastated. The taxpayers in Northern California should never have to pay for the rape of their resources to placate the greed of the Southern California politicians and businessmen.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. As described in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, under Alternative 4, Impact ECON-1, construction employment is estimated to peak at 2,427 FTE jobs in year 3. Total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) would peak in year 12, at 8,673 FTE jobs. Direct agricultural employment would be reduced by an estimated 16 FTE jobs, while total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) associated with agricultural employment would fall by 57 FTE jobs. Because construction of water conveyance facilities would result in an increase in construction-related employment and labor income, this would be considered a beneficial effect. For more information regarding funding sources please see Master Response 5.
4768	1	Anyone can see that the tunnels are not the answer to the water issues here in California. This is political rubbish at its best (well, worst). We all see right through this plan. Our Delta ecosystem is so fragile to begin with, that the tunnels equate to pulling out the bottom pieces of a Jenga tower. This is wrong.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4769	1	The Bay and Delta need to be protected, and the farmers need fresh water to irrigate vital crops for the world. The salt water will definitely enter further into the Delta restricting irrigation.	Effects of the alternatives on salinity levels are described in Chapter 8, Water Quality, and Appendix 8H, Electrical Conductivity, EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Modeling results indicate that the implementation of the water conveyance facilities may positively or adversely affect in-Delta water quality, depending on a number of factors including location, time of year, and hydrologic conditions. See tables in Appendices 8E through 8N for specific results related to various water quality constituents (including bromide and chloride). In addition to potential effects associated with the project and alternatives, modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the proposed project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present. Please refer to Master Response 14, Water Quality, for more details regarding effects of the alternatives on salinity levels.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4770	1	This tunnel idea is the worse of many ideas out there as it's far more costly than the other ideas, produces no new water, has strong opposition from many water experts, etc. Ridiculous idea and stop it!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
4771	1	California water allocations should not be about money.	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.
4772	1	I grew up here. Please do not destroy this serene environment for our generation, and generations to come.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place).
4773	1	This must be stopped!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4774	1	I am opposed to the Delta tunnels taking our water.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.
4775	1	The valley needs water to keep producing crops for all of America. The animals of the valley need this water too. We drained the valley of water when it was settled and have had nothing but sought problems ever since.	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 project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports).
4776	1	I have a voice and a duty to protect our water supply.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4777	1	I am no fan of this "new" water-grab scheme to shuttle water to the California southland. Los Angeles has done an remarkable job of dealing with limiting its own water thirst over the past years.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.
4777	2	The scheme puts in dire jeopardy the water quality, with an increase in salinity of the	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Delta estuary system. Only the water shuttled away will be "fresh" water.	
4778	1	The tunnels will destroy the eco-environment in the Delta. Leave nature alone!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4779	1	I'm signing because we need to protect our wetlands, our farmlands and our environment.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
4780	1	Water is not a commodity, it belongs to everyone.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.
4781	1	We need to keep our water where we can use it. Use the money to build desalination plants in the south instead.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
4782	1	It's not good for our Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4783	1	No tunnels!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4784	1	It's not right! That is not the legacy I am going to leave for my children. It would destroy the Delta forever.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
4785	1	I oppose building these canals.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4786	1	California has enough water issues why create more!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4787	1	The Delta is essential to the California economy as well as the fish, wildlife, farmers and cities that depend on it to remain whole.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
4788	1	I'm signing because I don't want the Delta depleted! Let Southern California fix their problems without destroying Northern California!!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4789	1	These tunnels will destroy natural habitat and let salt water far up into the Delta making the water useless for farming.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 14 (Salinity).
4790	1	It would be disastrous to the Delta, the lakes and the San Francisco bay estuary. There are many better solutions one being invest in building salt water/fresh water conversion plants along the coast and the infrastructure to pump it inland for water needs.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
4791	1	I do not want our Delta water sent to Southern California.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.
4792	1	It is just not a good idea. The river and Delta are too vulnerable as is. Leave them alone.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4793	1	This is a big ecological mistake. This decision is 100% political.	Since 2006, the 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 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).
4794	1	I believe the tunnels are a short term solution that will ultimately destroy Northern California river towns, by prolonging the destruction of Southern Californian urban areas, where water is scarce.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.
4795	1	There are better options.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4796	1	I dont want our Delta destroyed and all the wildlife that will perish in the process.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4797	1	The health of the wetlands is paramount, for a healthy bay. I'm a fisherman, save our salmon!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4798	1	I'm signing because the proposal doesn't address the water shortage and endangers an important estuary!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The hydrologic analysis in the EIR/S considered changes over long-term conditions which includes high flow

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>events and drought periods, conditions similar to the 1976-1977 and 1987-1992 droughts, as described in Appendix 5A, Modeling Technical Appendix. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change with continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).</p>
4799	1	Stop this plan which is a con!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
4800	1	I want the Delta thrive for generations to enjoy the beauty, the wildlife, the fishing, and the recreational boating. Don't ruin what Mother Nature has given us.	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.
4801	1	I believe this plan will most certainly wreak havoc on the ecology/economy of the Delta system 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. 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.
4802	1	I oppose the Delta tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4803	1	I love the Delta and the small farming communities it supports. The tunnels will destroy that...and for what? Poorly managed agribusiness and real estate development? No Tunnels!	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. For more information regarding impacts to agriculture and its associated mitigation measures please see Chapter 14 of the FEIR/EIS.
4804	1	I'm signing because I want to save the ecosystem in the Delta. These tunnels will not solve anything!	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.
4805	1	It's time to handle the problem correctly - not by damaging another resource!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4806	1	My friends and family have lived there for over 200 years, farming and caring for the land. To put their history, their livelihood, their future in jeopardy is unconscionable.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
4806	2	Besides that, the wildlife that live there will be harmed and they are already stressed with the drought we have experienced. Please do not go through with the tunnels.	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 animals. Both chapters describe the impacts, both negative and positive, and discuss the mitigation measures and avoidance and minimization measures proposed to avoid, minimize, and compensate for any significant impacts.
4807	1	We don't need tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4808	1	This keep coming up every few years. The people of California voted this down as a canal, so it comes back as a tunnel!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 36 for information regarding how the proposed project differs from the peripheral canal.
4809	1	It will destroy the natural habitat and estuaries of native species.	Chapter 11 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect habitat for fish. Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect natural communities and habitat for plants and wildlife. Both chapters describe the impacts, both negative and positive, and discuss the mitigation measures and avoidance and minimization measures proposed to avoid, minimize, and compensate for any significant impacts.
4810	1	You don't need to take water from our Delta. This is pointless, it's just for politics who are money hungry [expletive deleted].	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4811	1	I think the tunnels will do more harm than good. We should be looking at more storage options.	While water storage is a critically important tool for managing California's water resources, it is not a topic that must be addressed in the EIR/EIS for the proposed project. This is because the proposed project does not, and need not, propose storage as a project component. Although the physical facilities contemplated by the proposed project, once up and running, would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, the proposed project is a stand-alone project for purposes of CEQA and NEPA, just as future storage projects would be. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, of the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the development of alternatives. Please see Master Response 6 for information on Demand Management.
4812	1	I live near the Delta and have for my entire life. I don't want salt water in the Delta. I want plants and animals to continue living in this area.	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.
4813	1	The Delta needs to be protected, not destroyed.	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. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4814	1	To save the Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4815	1	Nothing good comes from destroying natural resources, animal habitat, and clean water supplies. The impact of a huge magnitude and not a real solution.	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.
4816	1	I'm signing [the petition] to save the precious wildlife of California.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4817	1	The Delta is an irreplaceable resource to Northern California: we can't afford to further damage it.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4818	1	This will destroy and allow salt water to come further into the freshwater rivers.	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.
4819	1	The Delta needs to be protected from private enterprise. The Delta environmentally belongs in Northern California.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4820	1	This project does not assist with the drought issues of an inadequate water supply. In addition, the damage to the Delta ecosystem will be so severe that it could ruin it forever.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The hydrologic analysis in the EIR/S considered changes over long-term conditions which includes high flow events and drought periods, conditions similar to the 1976-1977 and 1987-1992 droughts, as described in Appendix 5A, Modeling Technical Appendix. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change with continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).</p>
4821	1	As a lifetime steward of the Delta, I will not in any way support the proposal for water export tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4822	1	Profit is not the only consideration. Populations should be limited in areas of the state that lack water. Growth should occur where sufficient water is available to support it.	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.</p>
4823	1	To preserve the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4824	1	Life will cease to thrive in this area if the Delta is destroyed.	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.
4825	1	I oppose the Tunnel project. It does not positively serve Northern California and the proposed project would potentially damage the Delta and its diverse and vital environment.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4825	2	Effort should be focused on water storage in Southern California. Legislation should require Southern California to take responsibility for their immense water use – take care of themselves and don’t steal water from the northern half of the fabulous state of California.	Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
4826	1	I oppose the Delta tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4827	1	I don’t want to divert more water to an arid land. We need the water here. The health of the Delta depends on the water.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. 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 http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html).
4828	1	They need to leave the natural land and water alone. The farmers (we the people, rural and city) need the water for the produce and animal to feed ourselves. The drought has threatened that.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. In its efforts to achieve the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration, the California WaterFix seeks to protect dozens of species of fish and wildlife in the Delta while also securing reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California. Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed California WaterFix.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4829	1	We need to stop ruining the freshwater habitats of animals and be responsible and allow our grandchildren and beyond enjoy these beautiful areas and in doing this try to slow the salt water intrusion that is sure to intensify	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.
4830	1	No tunnels you will destroy the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4831	1	This is not an appropriate solution! Do not build these.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4832	1	I love the Delta and want it to be around for future generations.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4833	1	I love the Delta and want my children to be able to experience it as well!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4834	1	The Delta is like my backyard - I swim, kayak, boat, fish and the farming around it feeds America. Southern California does not get any more of this valuable water. We also need the habitats it provides in the Delta and bay.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4835	1	Save the Delta! Stop the tunnels! I grew up fishing, swimming and boating all over the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4836	1	I love the fishery here. The Delta, I would hate to see it change. I would like my kids to experience what I got to.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.
4837	1	Saving the Delta, where I live.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4838	1	This [the California WaterFix] is not the fix we need to solve water problems in the state's southern region. The money that would be spent on the tunnels should be spent on a proper sustainable infrastructure that captures and stores water during heavier precipitation to be used during dry years. Tunnels only rob Peter to pay Paul, with Northern California being Peter.	While water storage is a critically important tool for managing California's water resources, it is not a topic that must be addressed in the EIR/EIS for the proposed project. This is because the proposed project does not, and need not, propose storage as a project component. Although the physical facilities contemplated by the proposed project, once up and running, would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, the proposed project is a stand-alone project for purposes of CEQA and NEPA, just as future storage projects would be. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, of the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the development of alternatives. Please see Master Response 6 for information on Demand Management.
4839	1	The San Francisco Delta is unique in all the world. De-watering it would be a crime against humanity.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4840	1	We already have water problems; no need to make more. Southern California needs to start working on using or storing their own water and conserving water better.	Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
4841	1	We already have water problems; no need to make more. Southern California needs to start working on using or storing their own water and conserving water better.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 5 (Demand Management) and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4842	1	I'm concerned about environmental issues. Our Delta needs to be restored.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 5 for an overview of restoration and enhancement activities associated with the proposed project.
4843	1	Sending our water and building tunnels is not a smart decision for our state. Let Southern California learn to save and budget their own water. It makes no sense to destroy Northern California.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management and Master Response 35 for information on Southern California's water supply). Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.
4844	1	Fresh water is a necessity for the Delta as the country's bread basket.	<p>Please refer to Master Response 14, Water Quality, for more details regarding effects of the alternatives on Water Quality.</p> <p>RDEIR/SDESIS 4.3.4 (4A) describes whether concentrations of various water quality constituents are expected to increase or decrease with the project, relative to existing conditions and the No Action Alternative. To the extent that concentrations of various water quality constituents are expected to increase, 4.3.4 describes whether these increases are expected to result in impacts to beneficial uses of water in the Delta. For constituents for which adverse impacts were expected, mitigation and other commitments, such as additional evaluation and modeling and consultation with water purveyors to identify additional measures to avoid and minimize or offset these impacts, were introduced to address those impacts.</p> <p>Additionally, adding intakes in the North Delta will allow for operational flexibility that can improve natural flow in the Delta and avoid impacts to migratory fish based on real time data and operations.</p>
4845	1	The Delta salinity has risen plenty. We are destroying our farm lands.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
4846	1	Robbing Peter to pay Paul has never been a solution. No new water is created by this. Impoverishing one to enrich another is not just.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Water delivered to the SWP and CVP water contractors participating in proposed project would be within the existing contract amounts to serve agricultural lands that have been cultivated and existing and planned community populations. As described in Chapter 5, Water Supply, of the EIR/S, it is anticipated that climate change would result in more frequent and more severe rainfall events and less snowfall than under historic conditions. These rainfall events would result in periods of time when the capacity of the existing intakes would not be adequate. Therefore, the proposed project would provide the maximum capacity in the intakes and tunnels during those periods of time to convey water during extremely wet periods to areas south of the Delta for storage and use during drier times. The proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase flows in the wet winter months when the river flows are high to improve conditions for aquatic resources. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries in drier periods. The north Delta and south Delta intakes would only be used to divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements.
4847	1	I pay my taxes and this is not what I want it used form. Old man Brown needs to step back and realize what a bad idea this is.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4848	1	I think the tunnels will cause considerable deterioration of the Delta environment. The environmental impact study could not determine the effect on the most important species in the Delta.	The lead agencies disagree that the Final EIR/EIS does not determine the project's effects on Delta species. 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 plants and wildlife. Both chapters describe the impacts, both negative and positive, and discuss the mitigation measures and avoidance and

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			minimization measures proposed to avoid, minimize, and compensate for any significant impacts.
4849	1	The tunnels are a sin against nature, make no sense, will ruin the estuary, and are too expensive. Find alternatives, of which I can think of a dozen.	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.
4850	1	I grew up in the Delta as my father was a farmer. These tunnels will destroy the nature habitat.	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.
4851	1	Save the Delta! These tunnels will destroy the fragile ecosystem and do irreversible harm.	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. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4852	1	We need to keep our water.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.
4853	1	Northern California shouldn't suffer because Southern California doesn't know how to sustain their own water usage.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards. 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			exported supplies. The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change with continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).
4854	1	Northern California shouldn't suffer because Southern California doesn't know how to sustain their own water usage.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4855	1	Destroying the Delta and its wetlands is not an option.	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).
4856	1	Save the Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4857	1	Concerned it will be detrimental to the Delta ecosystem.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4858	1	Governor Brown, who sold the Kern Water Bank to Paramount farms, POM, and the fat corporate farmer couple Stewart and Linda Resnick? Give us back the Kern Water Bank. It belongs to Californians, not greedy Republican capitalists! No to the tunnels! Stop giving our water to greedy corporations.	As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decisions, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4859	1	20% to 25% of the water pumped south is lost to evaporation. Cover the two canals with photo voltaic materials and there will be no need for the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4860	1	Appreciate the Delta and would prefer more fresh water for the anadromous fish.	As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. As shown in

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Appendix 5A, Section C, Delta outflow would be similar under the proposed project as compared to the No Action Alternative.
4861	1	I don't want to see our precious Delta waterways messed with. I fish this region a lot and support our wildlife preservation and our farming communities. This will in fact disrupt the natural cycles of all life depending on its current environment. We spend a ridiculous amount of money on things that destroy instead of support our own local resources.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4862	1	Too expensive. Destroys wildland. Harmful to the Delta. Takes away much needed farmland. No on the Delta tunnels!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation) and Master Response 5(Cost and Funding).
4863	1	I'm from Sacramento. And I don't want the Delta to be messed with.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4864	1	I want to protect the fish in our system and stop the progression of this horrible destructive plan. We need to keep our water local Southern California needs to find their own way to produce water.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 5 (Conservation Measure 1 as a CM), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
4865	1	I am a conservationist who believe the Delta needs to be protected and the tunnels will destroy the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered 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).
4866	1	Fishing is part of our food source for the winter.	Additional detail related to microcystis (due to longer residence times of water) and mercury and selenium related to subsistence fishing was added to Chapter 28, Environmental Justice, in the RDEIR/SDEIS. As described under each alternative in Chapter 28 for Impact PH-3, the associated increase in human consumption of mercury caused by the action alternatives would depend upon the selection of the fishing location (and associated local fish body burdens), and the relative proportion of different Delta fish consumed. Different fish species would suffer bioaccumulation at different rates associated with the specific species, therefore the specific spectrum of fish consumed by a population would determine the effect of increased mercury body burdens in individual fish species. These confounding factors make demonstration of precise impacts on human populations infeasible. However, because minority populations are known to practice subsistence fishing and consume fish exceeding US EPA reference doses, any increase in the fish body burden of mercury may contribute to an existing adverse effect. Because subsistence fishing is specifically associated with minority populations in the Delta compared to the population at large this effect would be disproportionate on those populations. This effect would be adverse. Please refer to Master Response 14.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4867	1	I am against this because it will kill the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4868	1	I believe the tunnels are a detriment.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4869	1	The Delta needs to be left alone. It is a volatile thing to mess with the water, as we have seen in this drought. Tunnels will destroy the Delta levees.	Please see Chapter 2, FEIR/EIS, for the BDCP/CWF purpose and need, and Appendix 6A Sections 6A.2 and 6A.3 for discussion on existing levee improvement programs and funding mechanisms, which would not be affected by the BDCP/CWF. Levees are an important public safety resource and the proposed project would not change levee policy or replace ongoing programs and grant projects aimed at facilitating and supporting levee improvements in or outside the Delta. It recognized that levee maintenance and safety in the Delta is an important issue for the residents of the Delta and for statewide interests. Also, see Section 6A.6.2.1.3 for a discussion on DWR consistency with the State Plan of Flood Control (SPFC), and Section 6A.6.1.2 for information on project consistency with USACE, CVFPB, and DWR flood standards and regulations.
4870	1	We have to protect our wildlife.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4871	1	We need to preserve the Delta not destroy it.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4872	1	I am signing because going fishing in the Delta is a thing I do when I have free time.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.
4873	1	I have lived near the Delta almost all of my life. It is a beautiful area, rich with flora and wildlife. It would be devastating to Northern California to make it disappear.	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.
4874	1	The water is vital to our farmers and our wildlife.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Deliveries to in-Delta senior water rights users are the same under the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and all action alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS in accordance with existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.</p> <p>Considerations of adverse impacts to Delta agricultural water users due to implementation of the action alternatives (not climate change, sea level rise, or projected population growth that would have occurred with or without the proposed project) are discussed in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources. Changes in Delta water quality that could affect Delta agricultural water users are discussed in Chapter 8, Water Quality, including changes in bromide, chloride, and electrical conductivity.</p> <p>Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. The Proposed Project would improve conditions for aquatic resources by decreasing total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increasing exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high.</p>
4875	1	I lived in Stockton and sailed on the Delta for years. This is a unique and precious environment we must protect.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4876	1	We need to focus 100% of our energy on water-use reduction. Nature should keep its water.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4877	1	I oppose the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4878	1	Our unique estuary must be protected, if nothing else but for the food production it provides.	<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 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation) and Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).</p>
4879	1	No tunnel.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4880	1	It is a joke, and a waste of money and valuable resources. Zero new water created and this bill has been misleading the California people from the start. Changing the name of the project every time people realize what is really going on. No on the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4881	1	The Delta had been my home for a long time. The beauty and necessity of this area is beyond reproach. Without it this area will not thrive as it has for so long.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4882	1	You must be crazy to think this is a reasonable idea? There are better options out there, that do not destroy an entire estuary.	<p>Please note that the project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole. Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on 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>It is important to note, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>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>The plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Although the project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives), Master Response 31 (Delta Reform Act), and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
4883	1	I am fighting because I grew up fishing the Delta with my grandfather and I am hoping I could do the same thing with my grandkids.	Fishing would still be accessible throughout the Delta during construction, although it would be restricted in the direct vicinity of construction areas. Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass, and to Impacts REC-2, 4, 5, and 9 for a discussion of impacts to fishing from the proposed project.
4885	1	We must protect the health of the San Francisco Delta and Bay systems.	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 the mitigation measures and avoidance and minimization measures proposed to avoid, minimize, and compensate for any significant impacts.
4886	1	I am offended by Governor Brown's and the Water Board's effort to ramrod the creation of the Twin Tunnels into existence. The Twin Tunnels are a waste of the money. The voters who approved the Water bond in fall of 2014 wanted more effective and productive use of California water resources. They did not approve the Twin Tunnel construction.	<p>Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations.. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
4887	1	I am signing this because I do not think it needs to be any easier for Southern California to steal our water. We need above ground water storage and we need it now!	Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
4888	1	Governor Brown's choice (not We the People) is unsustainable.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4889	1	We need the water for farming.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. In its efforts to achieve the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration, the California WaterFix seeks to protect dozens of species of fish and wildlife in the Delta while also securing reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California. Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed California WaterFix.
4890	1	To save our farmland and our waterfowl.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4891	1	It is absolutely wrong. We need reservoirs and watersheds, not water going down south when we do not have water here in Northern and Central California.	Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
4892	1	The Delta would be destroyed.	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.
4893	1	The wetlands must be protected.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS presents and discusses impacts on wetlands and measures to protect them. Mitigation Measure BIO-176: Compensatory Mitigation for Fill of Waters of the U.S. provides mitigation to compensate for significant impacts on wetlands.
4894	1	I fish these waters my whole life and enjoy being out in the Delta so taking that away would hurt not only the fish but the environment.	The commenter does not offer any evidence on how the project would result in aquatic and ecosystem impacts related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4895	1	This will destroyed the Delta wildlife and salt water will be pushed into the Delta. If you destroy one part of the ecosystem it will affect everything else. I grew up enjoying these let us leave them for all the generation after me.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 14 (Water Quality).
4896	1	Please save the Delta. I ride a mountain bike on the canals. Please save this resource.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4897	1	I oppose massive underground water export tunnels now called the "California Water Fix" though it is essentially the same project as the peripheral canal, which California voter rejected in 1982 by a 62.7% majority.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Refer to Master Response 36 (Peripheral Canal).
4898	1	We have already destroyed the Delta for farming. Let us please preserve what is left, without the tunnels, please!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4899	1	I am tired of sending water to Southern California. They simply misuse and abuse it.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.
4900	1	Build more dams, do not destroy the Delta! Our current water storage was not built for today's population.	<p>While water storage is a critically important tool for managing California's water resources, it is not a topic that must be addressed in the EIR/EIS for the proposed project. This is because the proposed project does not, and need not, propose storage as a project component. Although the physical facilities contemplated by the proposed project, once up and running, would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, the proposed project is a stand-alone project for purposes of CEQA and NEPA, just as future storage projects would be. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, of the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the development of alternatives. Please see Master Response 6 for information on Demand Management.</p>
4901	1	Please keep our water where it naturally exists. Build a pipeline from east to west, but do not destroy the precious ecology of our state by removing water from where it has always been.	<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>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3. For more information regarding alternatives development please see Master Response 4.</p> <p>Please also refer to Section 1.4 of Chapter 1, Introduction, regarding the historical context of water in the Delta.</p>
4902	1	I strongly oppose the tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4903	1	I believe that Southern California needs to manage their resources better instead of taking part of the state.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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).
4904	1	The entire Delta system is already heavily overdrawn and has demonstrated the drastic and damaging effects of these prior siphoning projects to many species of native wildlife. This tunnel plan is another catastrophic yet obvious attempt to repeat the same historical problems and to add to their magnitude of damage.	Since 2006, the 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 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).
4905	1	I love the unique beauty of our Delta and support common sense solutions to problems, not this reckless, short sighted idea.	Since 2006, the 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 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).
4906	1	I believe the tunnels will damage the Delta and the surrounding farmlands and waterways.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Resource areas are addressed separately under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible.
4907	1	I am signing this because we need all the water we can get we are in major drought we need our water supply!	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The hydrologic analysis in the EIR/S considered changes over long-term conditions which includes high flow events and drought periods, conditions similar to the 1976-1977 and 1987-1992 droughts, as described in Appendix 5A, Modeling Technical Appendix. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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).
4908	1	You are going to destroy the Delta and its wildlife.	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.
4909	1	This is ridiculous, when will you learn band-aids do not fix the problem they are just cover up. This project is a band-aid of mass destruction.	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.
4910	1	I want the water to stay where it belongs!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.
4911	1	Save the Delta. No tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4912	1	I want the Delta to be restored I do not want no tunnels it is cheaper to restore than to build tunnels. No on tunnels.	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. See Master Response 5 for an overview of restoration and enhancement activities associated with the proposed project.
4913	1	Big agribusiness is forcing their way with the state Democrats to get water they do not need -- if they do not have water they need then they cannot grow those crops. This is all at the expense of a rich and natural habitat for fish, animals and the livelihood of families and businesses in the Delta and surrounding areas. It comes with a huge price tag -- all at the expense of the California taxpayers who get no say in the approval of the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. It is not the result of "favoring" large corporations (e.g., large agribusinesses). In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Change in Delta Exports), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
4914	1	The Delta tunnels are not a solution to California's water crisis. The tunnels only forestall the problem and divert money and energy away from real changes in water policy and	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		practice.	<p>by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The premise of the California WaterFix is that it will provide environmental benefits while stabilizing water supplies for a large population of California residents, consistent with statutory policy as found in the Delta Reform Act of 2009 (see, e.g., California Public Resources Code, §§ 85001(c), 85002, 85004(a), 85020.) Refer to Master Response 31 (Compliance with the Delta Reform Act).</p> <p>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 Response 4 (Alternatives) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
4915	1	The government is stupid and should let the People decide.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4916	1	There are other solutions than the twin tunnels. Desalination and recycled water solutions would be less expensive and equally or more effective.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
4917	1	Surely we should not destroy an estuary.	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.
4918	1	I am not about to let them take the Delta away from the surrounding communities.	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.
4919	1	Bad for our Delta. Bad for the valley. We cannot support Southern California.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4920	1	We need the water in Northern California.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.
4921	1	We need a state of the art green energy hydroelectric power plant at the Auburn dam site. Name it after Jerry Brown and build it!	Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>supply.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed and Master Response 6 regarding demand management.</p> <p>New energy generation facilities are outside the scope of the proposed project; however, nothing in the project would prevent other entities from pursuing innovative approaches to water conservation or energy production.</p>
4922	1	To protect our reservoirs and waterways in Northern California.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4923	1	I live in the Delta area and work in the urban city thus part of both water areas affected.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4924	1	<p>I am opposed to the tunnel plan. Your plan is going to create more problems than solutions.</p> <p>Stop the tunnels now!</p>	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4925	1	The tunnels are bad for the state economically, agriculturally and environmentally.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
4926	1	We do not need the tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4927	1	Will destroy the fauna.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The lead agencies disagree that the project will result in the effect hypothesized by the commenter. Chapter 11 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses measures to protect fish species, and Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses measures to protect wildlife species.
4928	1	It is stupid and a waste of tax dollars.	This 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.
4929	1	Not a well thought out solution.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4930	1	Stop the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4931	1	You will ruin the Delta. Screw the exports.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			operational flexibility.
4932	1	I am signing this because it is a waste of our tax dollars in an already shitty economy, and this will destroy the Delta. No tunnels!	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. For more information regarding funding sources please see Master Response 5.
4934	1	I am a native Californian and the "idea" will destroy the Delta, just like the Salton Sea was first created, then destroyed. There must be another option, use it!	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. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4935	1	No on the Delta tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4936	1	I do not feel that this is the "Fix" for our water woes.	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.
4937	1	I am signing because I believe this operation will devastate what is left of our beautiful state.	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.
4938	1	I do not believe it will help and it will cause contamination.	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.
4939	1	I want to keep my country's natural landscape.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4940	1	I am signing because the new tunnels will damage the Delta ecological system, the main supply of water for the San Francisco area, and because the water can 100 percent be used in a better way than growing and selling almonds and nuts overseas for a profit. You are the one who realized California is in a drought Brown! You made California cut back 30 percent and we did better Brown! Stop trying to get rich quick and actually think about other people for once in your pathetic life.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. 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.
4941	1	Why would anyone do such a thing? Please leave the Delta alone, we do not need to build a tunnel! What we need is to continue conserving water as a state.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4942	1	Health and environmental concerns.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4943	1	I think the Delta should be left in its natural state. When man intercedes, it never turns out well. Make the farmers collect rain for drought years to keep them in	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		business.	
4944	1	I do not want to see our Delta destroyed to provide water for Los Angeles!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.
4945	1	I strongly oppose the scheme.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4946	1	We need our water here! Do not give it away until there is an excess we can spare!	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.
4947	1	I believe this will harm our environment and the farmers' ability to continue to provide food for our country.	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.
4948	1	Northern California gives Southern California enough water already. And this is just too much.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.
4949	1	I do not want the Delta to be destroyed.	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.
4950	1	I am signing because the entire concept is wrong.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4951	1	I support our local farmers and I like visiting our Delta water.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4952	1	I oppose the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4953	1	We need to keep our water here locally. It is a waste of taxpayers' money to build these tunnels.	Please refer to Master Response 5 regarding implementation of costs and funding sources.
4954	1	It is a bad idea!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4955	1	I think the tunnels are a terrible plan!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4956	1	Save our Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4957	1	Taking water from this part of the state will only create major problems in the future. The ground is already sinking in the farming areas due to ground water used for crops.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The analysis in the EIR/EIS assumes that groundwater extractions in the Sacramento Valley would be the same under the No Action Alternative and the action alternatives, including the proposed project, because these alternatives would not include conveyance of extracted groundwater.
4957	2	Desalination is the way to go to provide the water we need in the rest of the stae. No tunnels! Save the Delta!	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
4958	1	This kind of project should be positively voted for by the people, not legislated into existence by politicians who do not even reside in the affected area.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 5.
4958	2	Furthermore, it is absolute madness to affect the flow of the Delta, which feeds one of the biggest and most economically significant farming communities in the nation (San Joaquin Valley) just to benefit a small group of cash crop growers (Las Angeles area but growers) in an area that should not be farmed in the first place.	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.
4959	1	The Delta is one of the only treasures we have left.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4960	1	The outdoors needs to stay the way it always has been! Do not mess with our water!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4961	1	I love the Delta. Leave it alone.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4962	1	Recreational sports are a huge money maker, fishing in particular. We pay a lot of money each year to fish, not to mention all the revenue you would lose by adding these tunnels, no more tournaments on the Delta to bring money nobody buys fuel in the local area, nobody pays for places to spend the night, so on and so on. It is a trickle affect. Not to mention our kids future. I have 3 and I take them out there all the time to catch striper, bass and panfish they are plentiful and they love it which in turn when they grow they will spend their money on a license and fuel and everything the need to go fish at their favorite spot.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.
4963	1	Jerry Brown is an idiot and Los Angeles needs to quit destroying the north state!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4964	1	We should not mess with our delicate ecosystem.	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.
4965	1	The tunnels will destroy the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered 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.
4966	1	These tunnels will ruin the state environmentally, especially the fish die-offs.	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. Chapter 11 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect fish. The Chapter describes the impacts, both negative and positive, and discusses measures that would be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts and to compensate for significant impacts.
4967	1	Idea is totally off base.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
4968	1	I work in agriculture throughout the Delta and I am a fisherman.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4969	1	I know this will destroy the Delta's environment. We cannot keep on destroying our homeland just for economic purposes. We cannot let history keep on happening again and again. I would love to bring my future kids out to see the Delta but if this were to happen I know I will never get to show our future generation this beautiful environment.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4970	1	I want the tunnel plan to stop. Protect our Mother Earth.	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.
4971	1	I live here and love the natural wildlife of the place. This project would destroy the fragile ecosystem without providing anything productive for our area.	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.
4972	1	The Delta is home to wildlife and farmland. Do not destroy this beautiful land.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4973	1	The Delta is a public waterway not a money pit for the government. Stop ruining our Delta.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4974	1	Protect the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4975	1	I fish the Delta all the time and I want to keep fishing it!	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.
4976	1	This is horrible for the environment and it is all about money and control. Damns and irrigation of the Delta are hurting it.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4977	1	This plan is not sustainable. Plans to develop sustainable solutions like benefits for reduction of use and grey water systems in residential and commercial spaces should be primary focus of funding.	For more information regarding demand management please see Master Response 6.
4978	1	We need the water here! Farmers do not have water, you do not have food.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. Senior water rights holders are not affected by implementation of action alternatives. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation would be able to pump from the proposed north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the proposed project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S.
4979	1	I oppose the Delta tunnels because it will lead to the destruction of the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4980	1	By saving the Delta from the tunnels we save California from the tunnels as well!	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.
4981	1	Wrong solution for Southern California.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
4982	1	There has to be a better solution than these tunnels.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
4983	1	This is hurting one of the best fishing spots in this country if this bill is passed.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.
4984	1	We own property on Steamboat Slough. We do not want the tunnels to make changes	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		to the surrounding environment!	<p>of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please note that Steamboat Slough is more than 3 miles away from the construction footprint of the preferred alternative, 4A.</p>
4985	1	I am signing because I believe in a river's inherent right to run free. Additionally, I do not believe that this project is environmentally sound or economically responsible.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
4986	1	I do not believe this is the right approach to solving the conflicting needs of habitat and secure water supply. Let's work in desalinization technology.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
4987	1	I love the delta and want my kids to enjoy it too	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.</p>
4988	1	I've enjoyed the beauty and recreation of the delta for 40 years and don't want to see it ruined. The estuary and delta need to be preserved as part of the native California environment and habitat for fish and animals.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4989	1	I do not believe in the cause of this bill.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4990	1	We spend a lot of time at the delta, we don't want it ruined.	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.
4991	1	Stop the tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4992	1	I like protecting our ecosystem.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4993	1	I care about the Delta	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4994	1	I oppose these tunnels! Save our wildlife and our water!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
4995	1	I am a recreational boater, but more importantly, I like to eat fish and crops grown by our California delta farmers. Oh yeah - I also like to drink water that is not salty or brackish.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
4996	1	The tunnels will be a shameful destruction of one of California's finest natural resources. State government needs to stop the "use it 'ill it's gone" attitude. State officials need to stop the bullying and use lawful procedures for such a monument undertaking.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
4997	1	The tunnels will have a devastating environmental impact in many ways!	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.
4998	1	I love the delta and want it to remain the way it is and do not want it to turn into a salt pit without fresh water killing everything for all generations to come.	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.
4999	1	I read the concerns and agree, the Delta Tunnels are very destructive, and there are better solutions!	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.