

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
500	1	<p>Please register my very strong opposition to the Governor's plan to build twin tunnels in the Delta.</p> <p>It is obvious that building these tunnels will ruin the environment of the Delta area. It will kill many fish species that are already having a horrible time and it jeopardizes the entire Delta ecosystem. We could go on and on about all the negative things this will do to the Delta area.</p>	<p>The commenter does not offer any evidence on how the project would result in Delta ecosystem and aquatic impacts related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
500	2	<p>It is just such a shame that the farmers in the Central Valley and the consumers and golf courses in southern California need water so much and that they so heavily outnumber voters in the Delta that they will see that this passes regardless of what it does to the Delta.</p> <p>Please do what is actually right and do not approve this ill-conceived project.</p>	<p>The comment addresses how water is used and who would benefit from the project.</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. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria 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. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. However, the project proponents have no authority to designate what water is used for.</p>
501	1	<p>The plan to build 2 (more?) tunnels to divert Delta water to the south is a disgusting travesty and must stop!</p> <p>The agencies involved have conducted meetings in secret, the state government hides its intentions and the private entities involved are outright deceitful. It is a bad plan and will harm the Delta ecosystem, not help it. I have read several lengthy sections of the so-called report. It is poorly done, obtuse and in many areas inaccurate or flawed (perhaps on purpose).</p> <p>Governor Brown and his associates should be ashamed to promote and support this. It will be stopped!</p>	<p>A hallmark of the public trust doctrine is that projects must have a connection to water-related activities that provide benefits to the public statewide; not sacrifice public benefit for private or purely local advantage. After balancing the benefits of the proposed project against the potential harms that the proposed project is designed to address, the public trust doctrine supports adoption of the proposed project as it offers significant environmental benefits.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 13 for detailed information about public trust and Master Response 41 for more information about transparency and public involvement.</p>
502	1	<p>I oppose the Delta tunnels plan involved with "California WaterFix" for the following reason:</p> <p>-It does nothing for the Bay Delta ecosystem but deplete further the fresh water that is its lifeblood, leading to increases in algae blooms, concentration of pollutants and increased salinity incursion to water tables.</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta and water supplies of the SWP and CVP for users located south of the Delta; make Delta water quality consistent with statutory and contractual obligations of the SWP and CVP; and improve portions of the Delta ecosystem, as described in Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need, of the EIR/EIS. Operation of the proposed water delivery system and SWP and CVP facilities would be 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 proposed project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including stream flows and water quality which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, needs of other beneficial uses (including the environmental habitat), the presence of threatened and endangered species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of proposed project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives, in the EIR/EIS. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits. Adaptive management is part of all alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS, as described in Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives. Under adaptive management and monitoring program, monitoring information and research results will be used to assess uncertainties and modify operations to meet the overall project objectives, including environmental habitat objectives. Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase flows in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries in drier periods.</p> <p>The EIR/S modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.</p>
502	2	The plan ignores any and all alternatives to urban sprawl and agribusiness and oil development which want more water all the time.	<p>The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The BDCP/California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta. It is important to note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). The proposed project would not increase the amount of water to which SWP and CVP hold water rights for use allowed under their contracts and permits and approvals for refuge water supplies or other environmental purposes.</p>
502	3	Fish and wildlife will be exterminated by this alternative, some to total extinction.	<p>The lead agencies disagree that the project will result in the effects hypothesized by the commenter. 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 measures that would be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts and to compensate for significant impacts.</p>
502	4	Water recycling, greywater pipelines, urban and agricultural water conservation innovation and investment are totally missing.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management). Some of these future water supply actions are included in the No Action Alternative and all of the alternatives, as described in Appendix 3D, Defining Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, No Project Alternative, and Cumulative Impact Conditions, of the EIR/S.</p>
504	1	<p>We write to thank you for providing a 60-day extension to October 30, 2015 to the comment period on the recently released Bay-Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP)/California "WaterFix" and the partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report and Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (RDEIR/SDEIS) and to urge that you provide an additional 60-day extension to December 29, 2015.</p> <p>As you know, the RDEIR/SDEIS contains substantial changes from the initial public draft and amounts to nearly 8,000 pages of additional documentation. Given the size and</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 39 for more information about the public review period, which addresses comments regarding the length of the review period and steps taken to facilitate document review.</p> <p>In order to facilitate a more easy review of the changes in the RDEIS/SDEIS compared to the Draft EIR/EIS, a version of the document was made available that included hyperlinks and track changes, in addition to a Section 508-compliant version.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		complexity of the documents, particularly in light of the 40,000 pages associated with the original draft EIR/EIS which provides the context and foundation for this latest proposal, we believe the current public comment period IS inadequate and an additional 60 days beyond the current review period is warranted.	
505	1	<p>The new WaterFix is only a downgraded version of the BDCP. It still is only a water grab for agriculture in areas of poor soil and dry conditions. It will not provide any additional water for the high cost of the project. It also will affect the water quality of communities along the lower Delta by drawing water further upriver and allowing salt water intrusion to move further upriver. Water mismanagement during the drought and declines in salmon, Delta smelt and other fish populations shows that the system cannot handle continued pumping at the expense of the Delta. Furthermore the ratepayers and taxpayers should not have to pay for a project that will provide water for the agricultural areas mentioned above that keep expanding and demanding more water while other communities along the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers are required to cut back water use.</p> <p>The threat of earthquakes claimed as one reason for the project are minimal at best. Other alternatives were not seriously considered. Strengthen the levees and look at water capture and reuse to use the current system. It is time that California looks at salt water [desalination] plants to provide water for almond and other crops that require high volumes of water. Since those crops provide very little to California's economy and started after the CVP was completed it should not have the serious effect on the Delta that it has from providing 80 percent of the water pumped out of the Delta for those owners to profit only.</p>	<p>The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians. Please refer to Master Response 5. 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, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply. No changes would occur to other water rights holders (see Section 5.3.1 of Chapter 5 of the EIR/EIS).</p> <p>The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, 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>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>
506	1	<p>Draft EIR/EIS Page 20-7, lines 16-18. The referenced sentence should be changed to read as follows:</p> <p>"Electricity within the Plan Area is transmitted by power lines [Insert]owned variously by the participants in the California-Oregon Transmission Project (COPT) (which include the Transmission Agency of Northern California (TANC), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E), the City of Redding, the Carmichael Water District the San Juan Water District,[Insert] [Delete]Western Area Power Administration (Western) and the Transmission Agency of Northern California (jointly own the California Oregon Transmission Project),[Delete] PG&E, SMUD, and MID."</p>	This sentence has been revised accordingly.
506	2	<p>Draft EIR/EIS Page 20-67, lines 23-24. The referenced sentence should be changed to read as follows:</p> <p>"The alignment of the canal and other conveyance facilities constructed under this alternative would cross power transmission lines owned [Insert]variously by the participants in the California-Oregon Transmission Project (which include TANC [Transmission Agency of Northern California], Western [Western Area Power Administration], PG&E [Pacific Gas and Electric], the City of Redding, the Carmichael Water District, and the San Juan Water District), PG&E[Insert] [Delete]Pacific Gas & Electric[Delete], Western [Western Area Power Administration], and SMUD [Sacramento Municipal Utility District]"</p>	The referenced sentence has been revised to more specifically define the crossed transmission lines.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
506	3	<p>The easements comprising the portions of COTP [California-Oregon Transmission Project] right of way (ROW) of concern are held by the United States and administered by the Western Area Power Administration (Western), a federal agency under the Department of Energy, acting as TANC [Transmission Agency of Northern California [Operations and Maintenance Agent, for the benefit of all the COPT participants (which include TANC, Western, the Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), the City of Redding, the Carmichael Water District and the San Juan Water District). Those easements include provisions to protect against any additional uses affecting the COTP ROW that could interfere with the safe operation and maintenance of the COTP facilities.</p> <p>Please see the BDCP EIR/EIS comments submitted under separate cover by Western. Those comments are hereby incorporated by reference to the extent that Western's interests and abilities to fulfill its contractual and other obligations to TANC on behalf of the COTP and its member and participants are in any way affected by the BDCP.</p>	The comment does not raise any issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to the Draft EIR/EIS Public Comments for responses to previously submitted comments.
506	4	TANC's [Transmission Agency of Northern California] comments herein are not intended and shall not be construed as authorization of, or acquiescence in, any particular uses of the COTP [California-Oregon Transmission Project] ROW [right-of-way] for the purposes of implementing the BDCP.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The comment does not raise any issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/ SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
506	5	[ATT 1: Figure 2: BDCP Alternatives Near the California-Oregon Transmission Project]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS. Please see response to comment 506-6 regarding the comment related to this figure.
506	6	<p>Potential BDCP Physical Impacts to the COTP</p> <p>Certain Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) alternatives have the potential to adversely affect access to the COTP [California-Oregon Transmission Project] and its O&M [Operations and maintenance]. Figure 2 [ATT 1] indicates the extent of the area where the BDCP alternatives would affect COTP O&M activities.</p> <p>Several types of construction activities are planned to be conducted within or adjacent to the COTP ROW [right-of-way], including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expansion of the Clifton Court Forebay/Byron Tract Forebay across the COTP ROW; - Permanent and Temporary Transmission Line Crossings of the COTP ROW; - Permanent Water Conveyance Facility Crossings of the COTP ROW; and - Potential Excavation and Storage of Residual Tunnel Material (RTM) and Other Spoils in the COTP ROW. <p>Each of these types of construction activities, and the long-term operation and maintenance of the resulting BDCP facilities are of concern to the TANC [Transmission Agency of Northern California]. The Draft BDCP EIR/EIS does not provide site-specific, detailed information regarding the methods and equipment to be used in the construction of the conveyance and transmission facilities as they cross the COTP ROW. The following comments address TANC's concerns regarding the need for advance notification and coordination with TANC and ongoing engineering and safety</p>	<p>The TANC will be provided 180 days' notice prior to any construction activity taking place within the California-Oregon Transmission Project right of way. Detailed, site-specific plans and information as applicable will be provided and part of the construction right of way process. DWR will coordination with TANC and other utility providers to ensure engineering and safety planning and practices are implemented. Mitigation Measure</p> <p>UT-6c, Relocate utility infrastructure in a way that avoids or minimizes any effect on worker and public health and safety, and AMM34, Construction Site Security, will both be implemented to ensure worker and public safety. For information on environmental commitments, AMMS and CMs, please see Appendix 3B of the Final EIR/EIS. Public Services and Utilities are also discussed in Chapter 20 of the Final EIR/EIS.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		planning and practices that will need to be implemented as the BDCP proceeds.	
506	7	The Draft BDCP EIR/EIS does not adequately acknowledge the public health and safety risks associated with construction activity in proximity to high voltage transmission lines. Indeed, Chapter 25 of the Draft BDCP EIR/IS, which addresses "issues related to human health and safety that could potentially be affected by implementation of the BDCP alternatives," (Draft BDCP EIR/EIS, p. 25-1, lines 3-4) makes no mention of these concerns and correspondingly, does not identify any mitigation measures to address these concerns.	Mitigation Measure UT-6c, Relocate Utility Infrastructure in a Way That Avoids or Minimizes Any Effect on Worker and Public Health and Safety, states "While any excavation is open, the project proponents will protect, support, or remove underground utilities as necessary to safeguard employees. The project proponents will notify local fire departments if a gas utility is damaged causing a leak or suspected leak, or if damage to a utility results in a threat to public safety." This Mitigation Measure as well as various other safety measures will be in place during construction to ensure personnel and public safety. Please see response to comment 506-6 for more information.
506	8	Crane and pipeline work under the COTP [California-Oregon Transmission Project] with the best safety plan and supervision. The risks here are not just damaging and deadly harm to the equipment, facilities, and people involved in the construction and operation of the Project, but also harm to the population in general and the economy of the Western region. Uninterrupted power supplies are central to public safety, health, medical care, vehicle and air traffic control, information exchange, the storage and provision of safe foodstuffs, freshwater production and sanitary waste disposal; in virtually every facet of modern life depends on grid reliability.	<p>Due to the nature of underground construction, the exact location of underground utilities cannot be guaranteed based on construction documents; the location can only be determined by careful probing or hand digging, in compliance with Article 6 of the Cal/OSHA Construction Safety Orders. Underground Service Alert, a service which provides utility location services, is not available until the time of construction.</p> <p>DWR will incorporate environmental commitments into this alternative that would minimize the potential for construction-related accidents associated with hazardous materials spills, contamination, or fires. The following environmental commitments would be incorporated into this alternative (Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * A hazardous materials management plan (HMMP) that includes appropriate practices to reduce the likelihood of a spill of toxic chemicals and other hazardous materials during construction and facilities operation and maintenance. * A SPCC Plan will be developed and implemented to minimize effects from spills of oil or oil-containing products during construction and operation of the project. * A fire prevention and control plan that will include fire prevention and suppression measures consistent with the policies and standards in the affected jurisdictions and will be in full compliance with Cal-OSHA standards for fire safety and prevention. <p>Incorporation of these environmental commitments would minimize the potential for construction-related accidents associated with hazardous materials spills, contamination, or fires, and reduce potential effects associated with increased service demands from new construction workers in the Plan Area.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure UT-6c (see response to comment 506-6 and 506-7, above), as well as various other safety measures will be in place during construction to ensure personnel and public safety. For information on environmental commitments, AMMS and CMs, please see Appendix 3B of the Final EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The balancing authorities and utilities have responsibility for managing outages such that power is maintained on the grid even when a high-voltage line is out of service. The outage management process will be implemented pursuant to applicable tariffs. To the extent a widespread power outage unexpectedly results due to the COTP being out of service, there is insufficient evidence to suggest that such an outage could affect environmental resources so any resulting impacts are speculative.</p>
506	9	[ATT 2: Figure 1, Byron Tract Forebay Expansion Across the California Oregon Transmission Project right-of-way.]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS. Please see response to comment 506-10 regarding the comment related to this figure.
506	10	BDCP Alternatives 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3, 5, 6A, 6B, 7, and 8 propose the development of the Byron Tract Forebay to be located immediately south of and adjacent to the existing	DWR intends to coordinate with TANC as needed to address these concerns.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Clifton Court Forebay. We understand that approximately 14 million cubic yards of earth would be excavated to create the Byron Tract Forebay, and that the Forebay would be used to provide storage of approximately 4,3000 acre-feet of water with a surface area of approximately 600 acres.</p> <p>We understand that the Forebay would remain permanently consistent with its purpose. Figure 3 [ATT 2] shows the area where the forebay expansions would cross the COTP [California-Oregon Transmission Project] ROW [right-of-way]. Forebay expansion across the COTP ROW would significantly and adversely affect the COTP facilities and ROW. Tower footings were not designed to withstand constant flooding and the reductions in stability that would result from permanent inundation. Specifically, the following adverse physical impacts would occur:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Excavation within 100 feet of transmission tower footings during construction would threaten the integrity of tower footings and risk the collapse of the towers. - Forebay flooding would severely reduce the integrity of the transmission tower footings, and likely result in tower failure. -The structural stability of five or more 500-kV COTP transmission towers would be threatened by excavation and subsequent flooding of the expanded forebay. -The cumulative impacts of excavation and flooding would almost certainly result in one or more transmission tower failures over time. <p>The proposed location of the forebay expansion is therefore unacceptable to TANC [Transmission Agency of Northern California]. Forebay expansion needs to be relocated away from the COTP ROW. The excavation, flooding, and protective levees need to be located no less than 500 feet west of the existing COTP ROW to ensure continued integrity of the COTP transmission towers.</p>	<p>There is also a temporary transmission line impact that runs northeast from the Jones Pumping Plant, on the south side of the canal. The region may also receive protection, enhancement, and management of grassland, vernal pool, and alkali seasonal wetland natural communities as mitigation for project activities.</p> <p>If this changes the proposed project characteristics, DWR will assess whether the change could cause environmental impacts different than those identified and take appropriate action to address those new impacts.</p>
506	11	<p>If the alternative selected for BDCP implementation includes expansion of the Clifton Court/Byron Tract Forebay complex such that it would inundate any part of the COTP [California-Oregon Transmission Project] ROW [right-of-way], the BDCP proponent agencies will be responsible for all additional and/or replacement right-of-way that may need to be acquired for relocation of the existing COTP towers. The BDCP proponent agencies would also be responsible for all costs for the design and construction of any new transmission towers that will be needed to maintain COTP service levels as the COTP is relocated to new ROW. The BDCP proponent agencies would be required to procure the new ROW with rights fully equivalent in all respects to the current rights. Full ownership and transmission entitlements associated with those rights will need to be vested completely to TANC [Transmission Agency of Northern California] and the COTP participants. The BDCP proponent agencies would also be responsible for full funding of all environmental studies, permit applications, and all other regulatory compliance requirements needed for relocating the COTP ROW, and the design, construction and commissioning of the replacement 500-kV line of equal or greater capacity. The BDCP agencies would also be responsible for payment of all lost revenues resulting from outages needed for relocation, replacement interconnection, and for all associated litigation costs.</p>	<p>DWR intends to coordinate with TANC as needed to address these concerns.</p> <p>If this changes the proposed project characteristics, DWR will assess whether the change could cause environmental impacts different than those identified and take appropriate action to address those new impacts. Please see response to comment 506-10.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 5 regarding Cost and funding of the proposed project alternatives</p>
506	12	<p>Permanent and Temporary Transmission Line Crossings of the COTP [California-Oregon Transmission Project] ROW [right-of-way] Draft BDCP EIR/EIS Figures 3-25, 24-6, 25-2,</p>	<p>As previously noted, Mitigation Measure UT-6c, Relocate Utility Infrastructure in a Way That Avoids or Minimizes Any Effect on Worker and Public Health and Safety, states "While any excavation is open, the</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		and others indicate that proposed temporary and permanent transmission lines needed for BDCP power could cross the COTP ROW. The proposed COTP ROW crossings could occur at COTP towers 156/4, 186/1, 188/3, 191/3, 193/1 and 193/4. Because these crossings pose potential construction, operation, and related safety hazards, construction practices will be required to be undertaken [with] standard precautions in the design and installation of transmission crossings of the COTP ROW.	project proponents will protect, support, or remove underground utilities as necessary to safeguard employees. The project proponents will notify local fire departments if a gas utility is damaged causing a leak or suspected leak, or if damage to a utility results in a threat to public safety." This Mitigation Measure as well as various other safety measures will be in place during construction to ensure personnel and public safety. Please see response to comment 506-6 and response to comment 506-7 regarding UT-6c.
506	13	TANC [Transmission Agency of Northern California] requests that written notification be provided to itself and Western [Area Power Administration] of all locations where temporary or permanent BDCP transmission lines will be crossing the COTP [California-Oregon Transmission Project] ROW [right-of-way], to be provided no fewer than 180 days prior to the initiation of construction.	The TANC will be provided 180 days' notice prior to any construction activity taking place within the California-Oregon Transmission Project right of way. In addition, DWR will comply with the applicable transmission owner tariffs regarding outage planning and notification which may require a longer notification period.
506	14	Access to the COTP [California-Oregon Transmission Project] facilities for inspection and maintenance, including access for heavy equipment, shall be required at all times during BDCP transmission facilities planning, construction and operation. All COTP ROW [right-of-way] access roads must be available at all times for emergency and routine O&M [operations and maintenance] activities.	The project proponents will make every effort to coordinate early in the process with TANC to ensure minimal disruption or impacts to COTP service and infrastructure and ensure access to facilities. Additional details will be determined at the ROW phase.
506	15	No transmission line crossings of the COTP [California-Oregon Transmission Project] ROW [right-of-way] will be authorized to be sited in a manner that would place new transmission towers within the COTP ROW.	Under Alternatives 1A through 8, electrical power to operate the new north Delta pumping plant facilities would be delivered through 230 kV transmission lines that would interconnect with a local utility at a new or existing utility substation depending on the conveyance alignment. The alignment of this transmission line and its interconnection point would be based on the selection of a power provider for the project following selection of a conveyance alignment. This selection is ongoing and the alignment of the transmission lines will be finalized at a later date.
506	16	At all locations where proposed transmission or distribution lines to deliver power to the BDCP cross the [California-Oregon Transmission Project] ROW [right-of-way], they shall cross under the COTP conductors. Further, these crossings shall satisfy National Electricity Safety Code and/or California General Order 95 requirements (whichever is more restrictive) for the COTP line under its maximum sag conditions.	The alignment of this transmission line and its interconnection point would be based on the selection of a power provider for the project following selection of a conveyance alignment. This selection is ongoing and the alignment of the transmission lines will be finalized at a later date. At this time project proponents will coordinate to ensure sufficient design of transmission towers and lines consistent with all legal requirements.
506	17	TANC [Transmission Agency of Northern California] requires that it be consulted prior to and during the installation of temporary clearance markers to indicate the closest safe distances from the conductors.	Please see response to comment 506-16 within this comment letter, above. The alignment of this transmission line and its interconnection point would be based on the selection of a power provider for the project following selection of a conveyance alignment. This selection is ongoing and the alignment of the transmission lines will be finalized at a later date. At this time project proponents will coordinate to ensure sufficient design of transmission towers and lines.
506	18	Permanent markers indicating the proximity of energized high-voltage power line conductors shall be required to be furnished and installed on BDCP electric transmission facilities before the completion of construction according to standard industry practices for such marker installations.	This level of design will be finalized in the final design phase of the project.
506	19	BDCP EIR/EIS Figures 24-6, 25-2, and others indicate that Modified Pipeline/Tunnel Alignment, Pipeline/Tunnel Alignment, Western Alignment, and Through Delta/Separate Corridors conveyance alternatives could cross the COTP ROW. Figure 4 [ATT3] indicates the proposed locations of these crossings near COTP transmission towers. BDCP excavation, construction, operation, and maintenance activities have the potential to adversely affect the physical conditions supporting the structural integrity	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. This comment is stating the general potential for adverse effects due to the proposed project alternatives' excavation, construction, operation, and maintenance. Specific comments on issues of concern are included elsewhere in this comment letter, please see responses to those comment regarding specific concerns of adverse effects of the proposed project alternatives on the COTP. Please see Appendix 3B of the Final EIR/EIS regarding Environmental Commitments, AMMS, and CMs. Public Services and Utilities are also discussed in Chapter 20 of the Final EIR/EIS. Please also see response to

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		of the COTP, ROW access, and O&M [operations and maintenance] activities.	comment 506-15.
506	20	[ATT3: BDCP Proposed Crossings of the California-Oregon Transmission Project right-of-way.]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS. Please see response to comment 506-19 regarding the comment related to this figure.
506	21	TANC [Transmission Agency of Northern California] requests an electronic copy of each draft version of any Project safety plan applicable to those construction activities within or adjacent to the COTP [California-Oregon Transmission Project] ROW [right-of-way] be provided to itself and Western [Area Power Administration] no fewer than 180 days prior to the approval of the plan for implementation.	As already mentioned above, the alignment of this transmission line and its interconnection point would be based on the selection of a power provider for the project following selection of a conveyance alignment. This selection is ongoing and the alignment of the transmission lines will be finalized at a later date. At this time project proponents will coordinate to ensure sufficient design of transmission towers and lines. TANC will be provided an electronic copy of each draft version of a Project safety plan in accordance with the BDCP/California WaterFix Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.
506	22	TANC [Transmission Agency of Northern California] requires advance written notice of at least 180 days prior to any construction activity to take place within the COTP [California-Oregon Transmission Project] ROW [right-of-way].	The TANC will be provided 180 days' notice prior to any construction activity taking place within the California-Oregon Transmission Project right of way. In addition, DWR will comply with the applicable transmission owner tariffs regarding outage planning and notification which may require a longer notification period.
506	23	TANC [Transmission Agency of Northern California] will require that the BDCP provide detailed, site-specific information regarding the construction practices that will be occurring within the COTP [California-Oregon Transmission Project] ROW [right-of-way], and within 500 feet of the COTP ROW that includes, but is not limited to: - Construction equipment; - Construction crew sizes; - The extent to which cranes will be used in installing the conveyance facilities; - Maintenance of clearance distances to COTP conductors; - The duration of all construction activities within the COTP ROW; - Excavation practices within or adjacent to the COTP ROW and transmission towers; and - Excavated materials transport and placement locations.	The TANC will be provided with detailed site-specific information prior to construction in the event that, after final design, transmission lines cross the COTP ROW. Please also see response to comment 506-21 and response to comment 506-22.
506	24	TANC [Transmission Agency of Northern California] requires that a TANC representative be on site at times when construction work is conducted within or adjacent to the COTP [California-Oregon Transmission Project] ROW [right-of-way] for any and all BDCP construction activities.	This level of detail and agreement will be determined during the ROW phase after finalization of the proposed alignment.
506	25	TANC [Transmission Agency of Northern California] will require the development of a Compensation Agreement for the time needed for on-site representation of TANC's interests.	This level of detail and agreement will be determined during the ROW phase after finalization of the proposed alignment.
506	26	TANC [Transmission Agency of Northern California] requests that all communications to TANC provided as requested in these Comments be transmitted in both electronic	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>and hard copy formats to the following TANC staff:</p> <p>Email:</p> <p>info@tanc.us</p> <p>psanchez@tanc.us</p> <p>dwagenet@tanc.us</p> <p>Regular Mail:</p> <p>Transmission Agency of Northern California</p> <p>P.O. Box 15129</p> <p>Sacramento CA 95851-0129</p> <p>Attention: General Manager</p>	Please see response to comment 506-21.
506	27	BDCP should coordinate closely with Western [Area Power Administration] consistent with those comments submitted under separate cover by Western to ensure that the BDCP does not cause any unsafe construction or operating conditions.	During final design, standard engineering practices will be followed to avoid adverse effects. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please see response to comment 506-6 and response to comment 506-7 for more information.
506	28	All temporary earthwork within or adjacent to the COTP [California-Oregon Transmission Project] ROW [right-of-way] shall be designed and implemented in a manner that results in drainage away from COTP transmission tower footings.	This level of detail and agreement will be determined during the ROW phase after finalization of the proposed alignment.
506	29	No cut or fill or cofferdam construction and/or dewatering activities will be authorized that could affect the stability of the COTP [California-Oregon Transmission Project] transmission tower footings consistent with all applicable government codes. Excavations will not be authorized within 100 feet of COTP transmission tower footings.	This level of detail and agreement will be determined during the ROW phase after finalization of the proposed alignment.
506	30	Residual Tunnel Material and any and all other excavated soil, spoils, or other materials will not be allowed to be placed within the COTP [California-Oregon Transmission Project] ROW [right-of-way].	This level of detail and agreement will be determined during the ROW phase after finalization of the proposed alignment. For more information on Reusable Tunnel Material please see Master Response 12.
507	1	<p>The proposed expansion of the Clifton Court Forebay will directly impact Western [Area Power Administration, Sierra Nevada Region]'s existing Hurley-Tracy No. 1 and 2 double circuit 230-kilovolt (kV) transmission line (HUR-TRY 1&2), Tracy-Contra Costa/Tracy-Los Vaqueros 69-kV transmission lines (TRY-CC/LV Lines) and the Transmission Agency of Northern California's (TANC) Olinda-Tracy 500-kV transmission line (TANC Line) as part of the California-Oregon Transmission Project. Western operates, maintains, and holds the land easement rights for this impacted segment of the TANC Line. When developing new transmission corridors, Western selects alignments that avoid crossing over or through open bodies of water unless required in order to span over rivers and/or canals. Reasonable access to maintain these transmission lines is critical to the operational reliability of Western's electric network and the TANC Line. An alignment of a Western transmission line over/through the proposed Clifton Court Forebay expansion is unacceptable to Western.</p> <p>If the proposed expansion of the Clifton Court Forebay is necessary as part of the</p>	If the proposed expansion of the Clifton Court Forebay is necessary as part of the project, then the lead agencies will implement Mitigation Measures UT-6a, UT-6b, and UT-6c in coordination with Western Area Power Administration, Sierra Nevada Region to verify utility locations and implement facility relocations in a way that avoid or minimize effects on both operational reliability and worker and public health and safety.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		BDCP, then the HUR-TRY 1&2, TRY-CC/LV Lines and TANC Line will need to be relocated/rerouted as required by Western and TANC. As these lines are part of the bulk electric system and critical to the reliability of the network, it should be noted that acquiring the necessary outages to relocate these lines may be limited or restricted under certain system operating conditions. The BDCP will enter into an agreement with Western which will include terms and conditions for advance funding and payment of all of Western's costs to relocate/reroute Western transmission lines.	
507	2	For the proposed temporary and permanent transmission lines necessary to serve the BDCP temporary construction activities and ongoing BDCP pumping loads when the tunnels are placed in-service, Western [Area Power Administration, Sierra Nevada Region] recommends an increase to the width of the proposed transmission line corridors from 150 feet to not less than 300 feet. Evaluating a wider corridor will allow for engineering flexibility during design and final alignment of the temporary construction and permanent easements that are expected to range between 100 and 150 feet for the 230-kV transmission line segments.	The GIS footprint used in the Final EIR/EIS analysis assumes a transmission line corridor of 50 feet. However, if during the course of project design and permitting, flexibility is needed to slightly increase the corridor width; the current analysis is anticipated to cover any of those impacts (the Draft EIR/EIS showed a transmission line corridor of 100 feet with no change to impacts). Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives, of the Final EIR/EIS, Section 3.6.1.6 and Appendix 3C, Construction Assumptions for Water Conveyance Facilities, describes in additional detail the assumptions used for this analysis.
507	3	Western [Area Power Administration, Sierra Nevada Region] expects the lead federal agency for the EIS will be the lead federal agency for Section 106 National Historic Preservation Act compliance and all other consultation requirements required by the National Historic Preservation Act and all other laws, orders, and legislation regarding Native American consultation, including appropriate Government-to-Government consultation with federally recognized tribes. The lead agency for Section 106 requirements would be responsible for all appropriate consultation with California State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and any other agency requirements. Western recommends that it be a signatory on any Programmatic Agreement and/or other appropriate agreements regarding Section 106 compliance for the BDCP. Western would review all cultural resource documents to ensure adequacy for Western's requirements as appropriate.	As discussed in Master Response 20, the Section 106 review and compliance will be carried out pursuant to a programmatic agreement (PA) 35 that will set forth federal agency responsibilities under the NHPA. The PA will require the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to complete the management steps for all future 37 undertakings necessary to implement the proposed project. The PA is now in development.
507	4	Western [Area Power Administration, Sierra Nevada Region] recommends that the transmission line portion of the BDCP be included in the project Endangered Species Act (ESA) and Section 106 (NHPA [National Historic Preservation Act]) consultation and mitigation. If the transmission portion of the project is not sufficiently covered under the project ESA or NHPA consultation and mitigation, then it could cause delays and Western will need to complete additional ESA and NHPA consultation. If Western needs to relocate/reroute existing transmission lines to support the BDCP project, it is likely that Western would need to arrange for a separate ESA and NHPA consultation.	The transmission line portion of the project has not been finalized as the service provider has not been selected. Three electric utility transmission service providers could provide transmission interconnection and services to deliver electrical power to the project: Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E), Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD), and Western Area Power Administration (WAPA). There are multiple interconnection options available to the electrical grid and supply for both the operation and construction electrical power. DWR's SWP Power and Risk Office (PARO) will lead the process of identifying, evaluating, and establishing the electrical interconnection of this project to the California electric grid. PARO will also lead the process of planning and obtaining the power needed to construct the project. ESA and NHPA consultations are ongoing and will be conducted prior to the determination of the final alignment for the transmission line.
507	5	One of the BDCP proposed soil spoils area is located in the vicinity of Western [Area Power Administration, Sierra Nevada Region]'s TRY-CC/LV Lines, towers 4/1 through 5/2, west of Clifton Court Forebay. Typically, the Western easement agreement restricts the landowner from piling or placing materials within the easement area. This restriction is needed to insure ground to conductor clearance of not less than 35 feet for the 69-kV circuits. In addition, 30 feet of unobstructed maintenance access is required around the towers.	The RTM area west of Clifton Court Forebay has been designed so that it would be adjacent to and outside of Western's easement area, and would lie to the east and west of the easement area.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
507	6	In general, plans for all tunnel crossings, spoil areas and any other use of Western [Area Power Administration, Sierra Nevada Region]'s rights-of-way or easements shall be reviewed and approved by Western during the design phase and prior to construction.	Please see Response to Comment 507-1 that references mitigation measures that will be implemented to insure coordination with any affected utility facilities / easements and utility providers such as Western.
507	7	Western [Area Power Administration, Sierra Nevada Region] requires an entity working in or around Western electrical power lines to abide and comply with the National Electric Safety Code and Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) standards. Equipment within a Western easement area shall not exceed (14) feet in height when the transmission line is energized.	The proposed project will comply with all Cal-OSHA standards. Please see also Response to Comment 507-1 which addresses coordination with any affected utility provider such as Western.
507	8	During construction activities, BDCP must prevent or minimize the proliferation of dust from contaminating and building up on insulators of nearby Western [Area Power Administration, Sierra Nevada Region] transmission lines.	Environmental Commitment, Fugitive Dust Control, and Mitigation Measure AQ-9: Implement Measures to Reduce Re-Entrained Road Dust and Receptor Exposure to PM2.5 and PM10 will be implemented to minimize dust from construction.
507	9	Abide by Western [Area Power Administration, Sierra Nevada Region]'s General Guidelines for the Use of Electric Transmission Line Rights-of-Way.	The lead agencies acknowledge your comment about use of electric transmission line rights -of-way. The construction management plans described in Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a will include this comment.
507	10	Western [Area Power Administration, Sierra Nevada Region] recommends it participate in the BDCP environmental review as a federal Cooperating Agency. As a Cooperating Agency under an appropriate agreement, Western will likely not need to supplement the BDCP NEPA documents, provided the BDCP EIR/EIS addresses Western's requirements. If Western does not become a Cooperating Agency, Western could adopt the BDCP EIR/EIS and then, at a minimum, submit comments on the Draft EIR/EIS and recirculate the document, or prepare its own NEPA document. Whether Western is a federal Cooperating Agency or not, coordination with Western throughout the NEPA process is appropriate and necessary to ensure that any action taken by Western to construct, remove, replace, install, acquire land, acquire easements, perform environmental reviews, etc. associated with the Western transmission system in support of the BDCP project is covered under the BDCP NEPA documentation (including required mitigation).	See Response to 1437-10.
508	1	Years ago I opposed the Peripheral Canal as a boondoggle subsidizing primarily corporate agriculture. Now that we are in the throes of climate change, this Peripheral Canal redivivus launches beyond boondoggle subsidies into the realm of fantasy. The opportunity costs for the billions to be spent on this project are immense. The damage it will do to the Bay and Delta concerned is immense. It's time for this project's proponents to recognize that the age of reshaping the environment through massive civil engineering solutions has passed. It's time to recognize that environmental changes well under way will make this stupid project obsolete probably before it can be completed. It will do more harm than good by a wide margin. I oppose it.	Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. For more information regarding the differences between the proposed project and the peripheral canals please see Master Response 36.
509	1	The Environmental Water Caucus (EWC) (a coalition of over 30 nonprofit environmental and community organizations and California Indian Tribes) request an extension of 60 days for submitting public comments on the more than 48,000 pages, constituting the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP)/California Water Fix Partially	The comment period for the RDEIR/SDEIS was extended by 60 days. Please see Master Response 39 for more information about the public review period. For responses to comments related to the Delta Independent Science Board's letters, please refer to comment letters BDCP 1448 and/or RECIRC 2546.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS (RDEIR/SDEIS) for the BDCP Draft EIR/EIS [http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Home.aspx].</p> <p>This Request is for an extension of time to comment on the subject documents. This Request is necessary because of the extraordinary volume of the technical and scientific material to be read, understood, researched, and then commented upon.</p> <p>Further, this request is made to provide the lead agencies time to remedy fundamental flaws identified by the State of California Delta Independent Science Board on September 14, 2016, wherein they found the existing documents, that unless fixed, preclude meaningful comment and analysis.</p>	
509	2	<p>We [Environmental Water Caucus] submit for consideration a summary of their [California Delta Independent Science Board] conclusions outlining serious flaws in the environmental analysis that preclude meaningful review or decisions based on these flawed documents:</p> <p>"The Current Draft falls short, however, as a basis for weighty decisions about natural resources. It leaves environmental impacts and underlying science unclear by deferring content to the Final EIR/EIS ("the Final Report") and by neglecting a number of problems inherited from the Previous Draft. The gaps include:</p> <p>Details on the adaptive management process, collaborative science, monitoring, and the resources that these efforts will require;"</p>	<p>The Federal and State Lead Agencies appreciate the time and effort the Independent Science Board (ISB) has taken to review the 2013 BDCP Draft EIR/EIS and the RDEIR/SDEIS, per the directive of the Delta Reform Act. In response, it is important to note the primary objective of the CEQA and NEPA processes is to disclose to decision makers the environmental impacts of a proposed action and alternatives, evaluating the potential for adverse change to existing conditions and determining if mitigation is available to offset the potential impact. These documents, along with many others developed through the project planning (e.g., engineering, economic, and other technical studies) and other environmental compliance processes (e.g., Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, and water rights compliance), will serve as the basis for the Federal and State Lead Agencies' review and consideration of the proposed project. The statement that the RDEIR/SDEIS "falls short as a basis for weighty decisions about natural resources" is misleading because the EIR/EIS is not intended to be the sole document the agencies will use for decision-making.</p> <p>The RDEIR/SDEIS followed NEPA guidelines (40 CFR §15022) by describing the incomplete and unavailable information. As a general discussion related to the environmental review process associated with major multi-year phased projects, the environmental review must be conducted at the level of specificity available at the time of the analysis. Both CEQA and NEPA encourage that the environmental review process is to be conducted at the earliest stage of development to allow for effective planning. Thus, this approach was used in the DEIR/S where components of the project to be implemented at later stages were evaluated at programmatic levels with the understanding that at future stages, additional environmental review would be necessary.</p> <p>The EIR/S has disclosed that there are multiple uncertainties at the later stages associated with climate change and the habitat restoration and qualitatively assessed those effects to the extent of the best available science at this time. This is a very conservative approach to disclosing the effects of the project. DWR and Reclamation have committed to implementing a robust adaptive management program to address these uncertainties and other questions that arise over the course of the project. The adaptive management plan will address screen design, operations, and habitat restoration.</p> <p>See also Master Response 33 concerning Adaptive Management and Monitoring, and responses to comment letters 2546 and 1448 from the Delta Stewardship Council. All comments received on the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS and BDCP and the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS are responded to in the Final EIR/EIS. Please refer to the tables of commenters and comment letters to review responses to other letters submitted. For responses to comments related to the Delta Independent Science Board's letters, please refer to comment letters BDCP 1448 and/or RECIRC 2546.</p>
509	3	<p>We [Environmental Water Caucus] submit for consideration a summary of their [California Delta Independent Science Board] conclusions outlining serious flaws in the environmental analysis that preclude meaningful review or decisions based on these flawed documents:</p>	<p>See response to comment 509-2 above and also refer to response to comments 2546-72 and 2546-10.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>"The Current Draft falls short, however, as a basis for weighty decisions about natural resources. It leaves environmental impacts and underlying science unclear by deferring content to the Final EIR/EIS ("the Final Report") and by neglecting a number of problems inherited from the Previous Draft. The gaps include:</p> <p>Due regard for landscape-scale restoration, restoration timing and funding, and the strategy of avoiding damage to existing wetlands;"</p>	
509	4	<p>We [Environmental Water Caucus] submit for consideration a summary of their [California Delta Independent Science Board] conclusions outlining serious flaws in the environmental analysis that preclude meaningful review or decisions based on these flawed documents:</p> <p>"The Current Draft falls short, however, as a basis for weighty decisions about natural resources. It leaves environmental impacts and underlying science unclear by deferring content to the Final EIR/EIS ("the Final Report") and by neglecting a number of problems inherited from the Previous Draft. The gaps include:</p> <p>Analysis of how levee failures would affect water operations, and how the implemented project would affect the economics of levee maintenance;"</p>	<p>Please see response to comment 509-2 above, and refer to response to comment 2546-73. For responses to comments related to the Delta Independent Science Board's letters, please also refer to comment letters BDCP 1448 and/or RECIRC 2546.</p>
509	5	<p>We [Environmental Water Caucus] submit for consideration a summary of their [California Delta Independent Science Board] conclusions outlining serious flaws in the environmental analysis that preclude meaningful review or decisions based on these flawed documents:</p> <p>"The Current Draft falls short, however, as a basis for weighty decisions about natural resources. It leaves environmental impacts and underlying science unclear by deferring content to the Final EIR/EIS ("the Final Report") and by neglecting a number of problems inherited from the Previous Draft. The gaps include:</p> <p>Deficiencies concerning: uncertainties and their consequences; linkages among species, landscapes, and management actions; effects of climate change on the proposed project; and effects of changed water availability on agricultural practices in the San Joaquin Valley."</p>	<p>The RDEIR/SDEIS followed NEPA guidelines (40 CFR §15022) by describing the incomplete and unavailable information. As a general discussion related to the environmental review process associated with major multi-year phased projects, the environmental review must be conducted at the level of specificity available at the time of the analysis. Both CEQA and NEPA encourage that the environmental review process is to be conducted at the earliest stage of development to allow for effective planning. Thus, this approach was used in the DEIR/S where components of the project to be implemented at later stages were evaluated at programmatic levels with the understanding that at future stages, additional environmental review would be necessary.</p> <p>The EIR/S has disclosed that there are multiple uncertainties at the later stages associated with climate change and the habitat restoration and qualitatively assessed those effects to the extent of the best available science at this time. This is a very conservative approach to disclosing the effects of the project. Additionally, DWR and Reclamation have committed to a robust adaptive management plan to manage these uncertainties over time. Master Response 4 provides more detail on the Adaptive Management and Monitoring program.</p> <p>See response to comment 509-2 above. For responses to comments related to the Delta Independent Science Board's letters, please also refer to comment letters BDCP 1448 and/or RECIRC 2546.</p>
509	6	<p>We [Environmental Water Caucus] submit for consideration a summary of their [California Delta Independent Science Board] conclusions outlining serious flaws in the environmental analysis that preclude meaningful review or decisions based on these flawed documents:</p> <p>"The Current Draft falls short, however, as a basis for weighty decisions about natural resources. It leaves environmental impacts and underlying science unclear by deferring content to the Final EIR/EIS ("the Final Report") and by neglecting a number of problems inherited from the Previous Draft. The gaps include:</p> <p>Concise and clear summaries--crisp yet analytical, and integrated with</p>	<p>For responses to comments related to the Delta Independent Science Board's letters, please refer to comment letters BDCP 1448 and/or RECIRC 2546. All comments received on the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS and BDCP and the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS are responded to in the Final EIR/EIS. Please refer to the tables of commenters and comment letters to review responses to other letters submitted.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		graphics--particularly comparing the alternatives in their expected major impacts."	
509	7	<p>We [Environmental Water Caucus] submit for consideration a summary of their [California Delta Independent Science Board] conclusions outlining serious flaws in the environmental analysis that preclude meaningful review or decisions based on these flawed documents:</p> <p>"The Current Draft falls short, however, as a basis for weighty decisions about natural resources. It leaves environmental impacts and underlying science unclear by deferring content to the Final EIR/EIS ("the Final Report") and by neglecting a number of problems inherited from the Previous Draft. The gaps include:</p> <p>Environmental impacts of California WaterFix need to be assessed more completely and clearly." [http://deltacouncil.ca.gov/docs/delta-isb-s-review-rdeirsdeis-bdcp-california-waterfix]</p>	Please refer to responses to comments 509-2 and 509-6. For responses to comments related to the Delta Independent Science Board's letters, please also refer to comment letters BDCP 1448 and/or RECIRC 2546.
509	8	We [Environmental Water Caucus] would add to the list the failure of the [Water Fix] documents to include the biological assessments or endangered species consultations for fish, wildlife and aquatic and plant species that are facing extinction or threatened with extinction. Lacking these critical documents the public and decision makers are precluded from accurately assessing and understanding how these species will be further harmed by dredging, blasting, road construction, power lines, barge traffic, noise, and diversion of water supplies essential to habitat and aquatic food sources..	The Section 7 biological assessments are documents that are prepared for consultation between federal agencies and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and NOAA Fisheries and are prepared separately from an EIS. The aforementioned agencies are two of several agencies involved in the decision making process and directly communicate with the Bureau of Reclamation during the consultation period. Concurrent with the development of the EIR/EIS, DWR and Reclamation developed a biological assessment for purposes of consulting under Section 7 of the ESA. That biological assessment was submitted to NMFS and FWS in August 2016 and was made available at www.californiawaterfix.com . A biological opinion is not required prior to the release of the Draft BDCP/CWF EIR/EIS, but Reclamation will not sign a ROD until the BiOp is received. The EIR/EIS provides the public and decision makers the information necessary to assess the effects of the proposed project. Please also refer to Master Response 39 regarding the timing for CEQA/NEPA and ESA review and approval.
510	1	The State of California is accelerating a water tunnels project to divert Sacramento River flows under the San Francisco Bay Delta Estuary. At stake is destruction of the West Coast's largest estuary, a nursery for fish and wildlife that feeds the Pacific Flyway (from Mexico to Alaska), commercial fishing operations in three states, a thriving tourist economy and vibrant farm community, drinking water for 5 million people in the San Francisco Bay Area, and essential natural water hub for recreation and community enjoyment.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
510	2	<p>Taking this water for export before it reaches the estuary and bay will lead to decades of public dissension and box the federal government into a corner replete with huge costs and obstacles to meeting its statutory and legal obligations. Independent state scientists recently testified that the project is legally deficient and not justifiable.</p> <p>[Footnote 1: See: Delta Independent Science Board testimony: http://deltacouncil.ca.gov/docs/delta-isb-s-review-rdeirsdeis-bdcp-california-waterfix]</p> <p>The proposed Delta water tunnels will not solve current or future droughts because they create no new water supply. [Footnote 2: See: http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Home.aspx] Moreover, they are so large they could easily drain the Delta Estuary of essential freshwater. Before saddling taxpayers with a multi-billion dollar mortgage, years of confusion and a legacy of conflict, more cost effective water supply alternatives must be considered and implemented. This multibillion-dollar tunnels plan hinders real statewide water solutions for California. Policy analysis of the proposed project fails to consider more cost-effective water conservation alternatives that produce more water now in comparison to waiting the</p>	<p>The Federal and State Lead Agencies have done their best to make the EIR/EIS for the proposed project as fair, objective, and complete as possible. The Lead Agencies are following the appropriate legal process and are complying with CEQA and NEPA in preparing the EIR/EIS for the proposed project. These agencies readily acknowledge, however, that the document addresses a number of topics for which some scientific uncertainty exists. Such uncertainty can give rise to differing opinions as to what conclusions may be reached.</p> <p>Operation of the proposed project water delivery system could not drain the Delta rivers and channels. The project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The BDCP 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 listed fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of 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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		decades it will take to construct these experimental tunnels before determining if the investment was worth it. [Footnote 3: See: http://www.ewccalifornia.org/reports/ewcwaterplan9-1-2015.pdf]	<p>Operational Criteria, in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>For responses to comments related to the Delta Independent Science Board's letters, please refer to comment letters BDCP 1448 and/or RECIRC 2546. Please refer to Master Response 5.</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 directly address 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>The proposed project is one component, among many, of the California Water Action Plan. The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/. For additional information regarding storage, please see Master Response 37.</p>
510	3	By the end of 2015, state and federal officials plan to have the Delta water tunnels project record of decision on your desk for approval. This may be one of the most important decisions you make as Interior Secretary and we, along with our representative citizen members, strongly urge you to make this decision your highest priority, give it thoughtful consideration, and reject the Delta water tunnels project. For decades freshwater diversions from the San Francisco Bay Delta estuary have been a highly contentious issue within the electorate, courts and regulatory agencies because of the potential damage to one of the largest estuaries on the west coast of North America and the impacts to surrounding watersheds, communities and water dependent industries. Past efforts to build similar water export projects were rejected by voters, and with good reason.	<p>The Department of the Interior will review the results of the Final EIS in accordance with the Purpose and Need statement (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/EIS) to identify the selected project in the Record of Decision. The decision will be based upon consideration of the range of alternatives presented in the EIR/EIS and the results of the impact analyses of the alternatives as compared to the No Action Alternatives and other relevant factors, including essential considerations of national policy.</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>
510	4	As currently proposed, the State of California's water tunnels project does not comply with federal law and it will prevent the Department of Interior and other agencies from meeting their collective responsibilities to protect the San Francisco Bay Delta ecosystem. The water tunnels would serve both the federal Central Valley Project (CVP) and the California State Water Project (SWP). The CVP and SWP currently pump freshwater from the Bay-Delta after it has flowed through the estuary from the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers. The State of California and USBR [Bureau of Reclamation] have now unilaterally proposed that the new tunnels would take much of the freshwater flow of the Sacramento River before it reaches the Bay-Delta and divert it underneath the estuary through two massive tunnels to CVP pumps near Tracy. [Footnote 1: The legal authorization for this unilateral federal action is not clear, especially given Congressional limitations imposed on the CVP coordinating operations with the State Water Project and mandated compliance with provisions of the San Luis Act CVP operations. The San Luis Act (P.L. 86-488) requires USBR to construct and operate the CVP's San Luis Unit in accordance with the 1956 Feasibility Report where US Fish and Wildlife indicated the San Luis Project is "risky" for fish and wildlife. And thus, they retained jurisdiction under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act. http://cdm15911.contentdm.oclc.org/cdm/ref/collection/p15911coll10/id/2106] An engineering undertaking of this magnitude has never been attempted. More importantly, it would have devastating impacts on the Delta ecosystem, and inhibit your agency's ability to comply with the Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act, Fish	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. Comment does not provide the trust obligations to the Native Americans nor what would constitute or cause a federal confusion. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		and Wildlife Coordination Act and to meet your trust obligations to Native Americans, especially those on the north coast that depend on waters from the Trinity River Division. The resulting federal confusion will lead to decades of legal and political conflict, not a good legacy for the Department of Interior. All of this can be avoided if you show bold leadership and foresight by rejecting this project.	
510	5	Diverting the highest quality freshwater inflow from the Bay-Delta system would lead to unprecedented change in the ecosystem character and sustainability. As for habitat and endangered species, they will be permanently, detrimentally affected. Impact studies on flow restrictions to San Francisco Bay have been largely excluded from public review and the resulting effect of years of flow restrictions omitted. Impacts to water dependent industries that count on a healthy bay and estuary have been ignored or brushed aside. Drinking and recreational contact water quality impacts, including flow related toxic harmful algae blooms will impact millions of people who depend on a healthy estuary to live, play, work, farm and fish.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
510	6	Madame Secretary, the Department of the Interior needs to speak with one voice in clear opposition to this project. Please listen to all your experts. Serious and potentially catastrophic issues have been raised by Fish and Wildlife Services' red flag memos [Footnote 1: See: http://www.allonewater.com/WM/WMArticles/Letter_From_Friends_of_the_River_About_Fatal_Flaws_21910.aspx http://www.epa.gov/region9/nepa/letters/ca/bay-delta-conservation-plan-deis.pdf], USGS has expressed concerns about pollution emanating from exporting more Delta water to irrigate toxic San Joaquin Valley west side soils [Footnote 2: See: http://pubs.usgs.gov/fs/2004/3091/ and http://water.usgs.gov/nrp/publications.php?plD=528d1de3e4b0c629af455a32&sciName=Theresa%20S%20Presser], and an Interior commissioned National Academy of Sciences (NRC Report) report concluded the water tunnels approach "contains critical scientific gaps." [Footnote 3: See: http://dels.nas.edu/resources/static-assets/materials-based-on-reports/reports-in-brief/bay-delta-report-brief-final.pdf] These experts, along with National Marine Fisheries and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, have rung alarm bells, informing you that if approved, you won't be able to meet your legal duties. [Footnote 4: See: http://www.friendsoftheriver.org/site/DocServer/8-26-14_EPA_Cmmnt_on_BDCP.pdf?docID=9539 ; http://www.friendsoftheriver.org/site/DocServer/7_16_14_Corps_cmts.pdf?docID=9701 http://www.friendsoftheriver.org/site/DocServer/9_9_15_BDCP_final_ltr.pdf?docID=10384] USBR [Bureau of Reclamation] has failed to look at alternative operations that will not have such devastating impacts on fish and wildlife. [Footnote 5: See http://www.essexpartnership.com/bdcp/summary-of-fish-scenario-modeling/]	All comments received during the 2013 and 2015 public comment period are included in the FEIR/EIS. Please refer to the table of commenters to locate the letter of interest and relevant response. The Federal and State Lead Agencies have done their best to make the EIR/EIS for the proposed project as fair, objective, and complete as possible. The Lead Agencies are following the appropriate legal process and are complying with CEQA and NEPA in preparing the EIR/EIS for the proposed project. These agencies readily acknowledge, however, that the document addresses a number of topics for which some scientific uncertainty exists. Such uncertainty can give rise to differing opinions as to what conclusions may be reached.
510	7	Prior to your decision to proceed, USBR [Bureau of Reclamation] jumped the gun to file a water rights application for new points of diversion for the tunnels with the State Water Resources Control Board, assuming that the project complies with all applicable federal laws and regulations. [Footnote 1: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/applications/petitions/2007/20245usbr_petition.pdf http://restorethedelta.org/blog/delta-tunnel-news-ca-water-board-gets-fixed-applicati	Please refer to Master Response 45, regarding permitting processes and the appropriateness of this approach and Master Response 29, regarding the Endangered Species Act and timing for completing the ESA Section 7 process. Decisions about approval of a particular alternative are not included in the EIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>on-to-take-water/</p> <p>See also the permit application to the Army Corps: https://s3.amazonaws.com/californiawater/pdfs/5n2mg_Complete_Final_CA_Water_Fix_USACE_404_Permit_Application.pdf] On the contrary, compliance is highly doubtful. We have a classic case in which different agencies within the Department go in different directions before you, Madam Secretary, have given unambiguous policy direction, let alone approved any Record of Decision (ROD) on the water tunnels project. In addition to the water rights filing, USBR petitioned the Army Corps of Engineers for permission to perform dredge and fill construction activities for the water tunnels long before the project has received other necessary approvals. This heightens the public's fears that USBR and the State are trying to force the project through administrative channels without proper review. On the other hand, their inaction with regard to Section 7 consultation with the fisheries agencies compounds the public's fears that realistic and prudent alternatives are being ignored and avoided. Their actions with the State Water Board and the Corps of Engineers are premature given their inaction on Section 7 consultation, and should be withdrawn. Embedded in this rush to act before safeguards are approved and analysis is completed, is the notion of building a project without operating plans. Building it now and learning to operate it later is not a recipe for success.</p> <p>Madam Secretary, the Delta water tunnels project is a massive experiment that has not been adequately thought through and presents unprecedented environmental and economic risks. The CVP and SWP already have a lengthy history of not meeting conservation objectives. For almost a decade, the projects' coordinated operations have made little or no progress in meeting required mitigation measures including the required purchase of 27,000 acres of endangered species habitat. [Footnote 2: http://deltacouncil.ca.gov/sites/default/files/documents/files/Final_RPA_Matrix_for_Annual-Review_10_1_13.pdf</p> <p>http://www.water.ca.gov/environmentalservices/frpa.cfm</p> <p>http://www.fws.gov/sfbaydelta/documents/delta_smelt_water_projects_bo_briefing_jan_23-24-2013.pdf] Populations of listed fish species have declined to dangerous levels in this period. There should be no rush to make decisions that would hasten their extinction.</p>	
510	8	<p>Prior to any decision on this contentious, expensive and risky project, please meet with us [Environmental Water Caucus, et al.]. Such a meeting is essential to understanding the impacts from the proposed tunnels project as it proposes to pick one region of the state over another, creating needless dissension and destruction of the one of the United States' most vibrant estuaries. The San Francisco Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta and San Francisco Bay serve as a nursery and breeding grounds for iconic species on the brink of becoming extinct, such as salmon that, if lost, will set in motion an ecological chain reaction extinguishing orcas (Orcinus orca) and along with support for over 750 species. Please protect this national treasure and stand firm in the defense of our legal and environmental protections, put in place to defend the economic viability and natural resources owned by the people, of the United States of America.</p>	<p>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, not detrimental. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
514	1	<p>The Illuminati minion, Governor Brown, wants everyone to water-conserve (we never waste anything), yet allows Walmart and Nestle to drain our water supply so they can</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		bottle them to sell back to us if we can afford to buy them. This is a waste of my time since I know this communication is going nowhere.	
515	1	It is unacceptable that the moguls of California industrial agriculture should attempt to shape California State water policy. What an outrage that the abundantly profitable almond industry alone uses 10% of our fresh water, to the huge detriment of California's salmon and other fisheries that contribute to California's economy much more widely than the almond business. New almond orchards have been planted in the past two years, well after it was apparent we'd be suffering an ongoing drought. Central Valley industrial agriculture's profit drive and disproportionate and careless use of our valuable and limited fresh water must be curbed. The hugely costly, wasteful, and environmentally destructive twin tunnels must not be permitted.	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.
515	2	It is shameful that California and federal government officials would choose to drown more of the Winnemum Wintu traditional lands, most already taken, by raising the Shasta Dam. Underground water storage is much less destructive and more effective. It is unconscionable to propose to flood Indian lands in order to ensure profits for growers who choose to plant year-round water-needy almond orchards instead of growing seasonal crops appropriate to California's limited and overdrawn water.	The commenter's opinion related to the DEIR/S is acknowledged.
515	3	Please deny Reclamation's petition to weaken the dissolved oxygen standard on the Stanislaus River in order to protect fall- and spring-run San Joaquin River Chinook salmon; please reconsider your approval of current Shasta Reservoir operations in order to avoid loss of the 2015 year class of both the fall and winter Sacramento River Chinook salmon runs; and please act more aggressively to assert your authority to ensure that Reclamation and other water agencies do not sacrifice the estuary's unique fish populations for short-term deliveries to irrigators.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
516	1	I volunteer with two wildlife organizations and see firsthand the death of wildlife due to humans over use of resources. California, and for that matter, the world needs the fresh water to flow into the bay, not to be shipped to some special interests who stand to profit from our water.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The Proposed Project has been developed with the goals of minimizing and avoiding incidental take of listed species to the maximum extent practicable. Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 12, Terrestrial Biological Resources, EIR/EIS, describe effects of the Proposed Project and several alternatives on fish and wildlife species in the Plan Area.</p> <p>Section 7 requires that federal agencies, in consultation with the federal fish and wildlife agencies, ensure that their actions are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of species or result in modification or destruction of critical habitat.</p>
516	2	<p>I want to ask -- where are the salmon?</p> <p>The Delta used to have massive numbers of salmon. These should be designated a National Treasure but we are going to gut the river and Delta even more to further reduce salmon numbers. Instead we should be going in the opposite direction to restore these fish to their historic numbers. We have determined that agriculture wins over wildlife and I believe that is a mistake and a catastrophic mistake. Please, do not approve this massive water grab by special interests.</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.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
517	1	As a taxpayer group, we [Middle Class Taxpayers Association] are concerned that our dirt levees, aqueducts and pipes that bring water south from the Sierra Nevada Mountains [are] deteriorating and at risk of collapse in the event of a natural disaster. As the system ages, it is not a question of "if" but "when" the failure will occur. Once it fails, the restoration and compensation costs will be of the order of multiple times that which will be incurred if a modern pipeline is built with adequate mitigation against these natural disasters. This is an insurance policy for taxpayers, that comes with added benefits of restoring natural flows to protect fish and wildlife.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. The comment describes the benefits of the proposed project. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the EIR/EIS.</p>
517	2	Water supply is critical to replenishing the tax base, from economic activity of farms, factories and businesses. By capturing water efficiently, and moving it safely to where it is needed, this project generates the best value for our tax dollars. It is both fiscally prudent as well as necessary to invest in a stronger middle-class, that this project will serve. We [Middle Class Taxpayers Association] therefore urge the Department of Water Resources and Governor Jerry Brown's Administration to build the California WaterFix and the California EcoRestore.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
518	1	I am opposed to this plan. Though it is proposed to be a conservation plan for the Delta and Bay, I feel it is a scheme to bypass the will of the citizens of this state who have at least twice defeated at the polls initiatives which would have constructed a peripheral canal to route water from north of the Delta to the Westlands agricultural interests in the desert Central Valley for their profits. It will not be conserving the states fisheries or the lands of Native Americans in the north of the state.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
519	1	<p>I lived in California for most of my life. Now I'm following California's water dilemma and drought from Oregon. Most of Oregon's counties, by the way, have declared a drought emergency.</p> <p>I remember the proposal, in the early 1980s, to build a peripheral canal. This canal would have been constructed on the periphery of the Bay/Delta area in northern California, and transported water to the south. This proposal was defeated in an election, by voters from all parts of the state.</p> <p>Governor Brown's idea to build a big pipeline to transport water from north to south, is reminiscent of the peripheral canal. I hope that his idea goes down in flames.</p> <p>California is reducing water use among residents. Many have responded admirably. Perhaps other sectors of the state have not sacrificed as has the residential portion. Most of California's water is used by agriculture.</p> <p>I hope that the projected El Nino this winter dumps lots of rain on your state. I hope that the Sierra Nevada range gets a nice snowpack. It is grim to think about another drought year in California.</p>	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 34 for additional details on beneficial use, including the use of water for agricultural use.
520	1	As a long time owner/manager of land on Grizzly Island in the Suisun Marsh and Chairman of Schafer-Pintail Reclamation District 2112, I believe the comments in Tony Vaccarella's letter speak volumes against the Bay Delta Conservation Plan.	The comment expresses support for the referenced attachment from the Suisun Resource Conservation District, which presented comments opposing the BDCP. Please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. Alternative 4A, developed as a result of agency and public input, is the new preferred alternative under CEQA and NEPA. All comments received during the 2013 and 2015 public comment period are included in the FEIR/EIS. Please refer to the table of commenters to locate the letter of interest.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
520	2	ATT 1: Letter from Suisun Resource Conservation District comments on Draft BDCP.	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS. See Response to Comment 520-1.
521	1	<p>I oppose the project and request that alternative ideas for the water conveyance be considered.</p> <p>The Sacramento Delta is the closest natural wildlife area near Sacramento, a short 5 mile drive to the Delta gives people an outlet to do all the outdoor activities, fishing, boating, swimming, wine tasting, and spring and summer drives through our great Delta. Finally, we have a lovely area for all to enjoy; Coming alive by families and people working and living in the delta. How can this be ignored and not a major component in the thinking of approving this project?</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Discussions about impacts on recreation under the preferred alternative, 4A, can be found in Chapter 15, Recreation.</p>
522	1	The tunnels can serve no other purpose than to supply more of our precious river water to central and southern California money interests.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
522	2	Jerry Brown is lining his pockets and building an ego project so that he can leave a legacy bigger than his father's.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
522	3	Stop the tunnel project!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
523	1	<p>I live in Tracy Ca and I don't want the tunnels!</p> <p>Please leave water where it flows naturally! We are in the situations we are in now because we keep messing with nature. Damaging and manipulating it the way we want it to be never thinking nature knows best, it's been around long before our genetics ever started to be. We need to go back to how nature intended the water and growing things to be, without manipulation or redirecting. Our world was better off before us because it was how it was supposed to be. That's why it was such a hospitable environment, please restore our hospitable environment and end the destruction. We need to come up with local solutions to local issues not take water from areas that shouldn't be taken. It's not supposed to be there otherwise nature would put it there. Leave water where it naturally occurs don't steal water, it's damaging those it's stolen from.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
524	1	<p>Do not move forward with this project! The Delta is a natural wonder in itself. Do not do a man-made fix that will destroy it! This will not fix California water issues.</p> <p>I have not heard one person that I have spoken to say they want this project</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.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
525	1	<p>3 of my 4 grandparents were farmers. We are lucky to have the produce we get from the Central Valley.</p> <p>However - I do not agree at all with the delta tunnels.</p> <p>We are using more water than we have!</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
526	1	<p>Comments to request for review for the Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report/Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California Water Fix Project, SCH# 2008032062, Contra Costa, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Solano, and Yolo Counties</p> <p>Pursuant to the State Clearinghouse's 7 August 2015 request, the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Valley Water Board) has reviewed the Request for Review for the Recirculated Draft Environment Impact Report/Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California Water Fix Project, located in Contra Costa, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Solano, and Yolo Counties.</p> <p>Our agency is delegated with the responsibility of protecting the quality of surface and groundwaters of the state; therefore our comments will address concerns surrounding those issues.</p> <p>I. Regulatory Setting</p> <p>Basin Plan:</p> <p>The Central Valley Water Board is required to formulate and adopt Basin Plans for all areas within the Central Valley region under Section 13240 of the Porter-Cologne Water Control Act. Each Basin Plan must contain water quality objectives to ensure the reasonable protection of beneficial uses, as well as a program of implementation for achieving water quality objectives with the Basin Plans. Federal regulations require each state to adopt water quality standards to protect the public health or welfare, enhance the quality of water and serve the purposes of the Clean Water Act. In California, the beneficial uses, water quality objectives, and the Antidegradation Policy are the State's water quality standards. Water quality standards are also contained in the National Toxics Rule, 40 CFR Section 131.36, and the California Toxics Rule, 40 CFR Section 131.38.</p> <p>The Basin Plan is subject to modification as necessary, considering applicable laws, policies, technologies, water quality conditions and priorities. The original Basin Plans were adopted in 1975, and have been updated and revised periodically as required, using Basin Plan amendments. Once the Central Valley Water Board has adopted a Basin Plan amendment in noticed public hearings, it must be approved by the State</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p> <p>The Lead Agencies appreciate the CVWQB's information. Additional information regarding responsible agencies are detailed in Chapter 1 of the Final EIR/EIS and various Master Responses provided for public review in the Final EIR/EIS describe additional permitting compliance related to the proposed project.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board), Office of Administrative Law (OAL) and in some cases, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). Basin Plan amendments only become effective after they have been approved by the OAL and in some cases, the USEPA. Every three (3) years, a review of the Basin is completed that assess the appropriateness of existing standards and evaluates and prioritizes Basin Planning issues.</p> <p>For more information on the Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins, Please visit our website:</p> <p>http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/.</p> <p>II. Permitting Requirements</p> <p>Construction Storm Water General Permit</p> <p>Dischargers whose projects disturb one or more acres of soil or where projects disturb less than one acre but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres, are required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activities (Construction General Permit), Construction General Permit Order No. 2009-009-DWQ. Construction Activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, grubbing, disturbances to the ground, such as stockpiling, or excavation, but does not include regular maintenance activities performed to restore the original line, grade, or capacity of the facility. The Construction General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).</p> <p>For more information on the Construction General Permit, visit the State Water Resources Control Board website at:</p> <p>http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/constpermits.shtml.</p> <p>Phase I and II Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permits [Municipal Permits = The Phase I Municipal Separate Storm Water System (MS4) Permit covers medium sized Municipalities (serving between 100,000 and 250,000 people) and large sized municipalities (serving over 250,000 people). The Phase II MS4 provides coverage for small municipalities, including non-traditional Small MS4s, which include military bases, public campuses, prisons, and hospitals.]</p> <p>The Phase I and II MS4 permits require the Permittees reduce pollutants and runoff flows from new development and redevelopment using Best Management Practices (BMPs) to the maximum extent practicable (MEP). MS4 Permittees have their own development standards, also known as Low Impact Development (LID)/post-construction standards that include a hydromodification component. The MS4 permits also require specific design concepts for LID/post-construction BMPs in the early stages of a project during the entitlement and CEQA process and the development plan review process.</p> <p>For more information on which Phase I MS4 Permit this project applies to, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:</p> <p>http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/storm_water/municipal_p</p>	

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>permits/.</p> <p>For more information on the Phase II MS4 permit and who it applies to, visit the State Water Resources Control Board at:</p> <p>http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/phase_ii_municipal.shtml.</p> <p>Industrial Storm Water General Permit</p> <p>Storm water discharges associated with industrial sites must comply with the regulations contained in the industrial Storm Water General Permit Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ.</p> <p>For more information on the Industrial Storm Water General Permit, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:</p> <p>http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/storm_water/industrial_general_permits/index.shtml.</p> <p>Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit</p> <p>If the project will involve the discharge of dredged or fill material in navigable waters or wetlands, a permit pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act may be needed from the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE). If a Section 404 permit is required by the USACOE, the Central Valley Water Board will review the permit application to ensure that discharge will not violate water quality standards. If the project requires surface water drainage realignment, the applicant is advised to contact the Department of Fish and Game for information on Streambed Alteration Permit requirements.</p> <p>If you have any questions regarding the Clean Water Act Section 404 permits, please contact the Regulatory Division of the Sacramento District of USACOE at (916) 557-5250.</p> <p>Clean Water Act Section 401 Permit - Water Quality Certification</p> <p>If an USACOE permit (e.g., Non-Reporting Nationwide Permit, Nationwide Permit, Letter of Permission, Individual Permit, Regional General Permit, Programmatic General Permit), or any other federal permit (e.g., Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act or Section 9 of the United States Coast Guard), is required for this project due to the disturbance of waters of the United States (such as streams and wetlands), then a Water Quality Certification must be obtained from the Central Valley Water Board prior to initiation of project activities. There are no waivers for 401 Water Quality Certifications.</p> <p>Waste Discharge Requirements - Discharges to Waters of the State</p> <p>If USACOE determines that only non-jurisdictional waters of the State (i.e., "non-federal" waters of the State) are present in the proposed project area, the proposed project may require a Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) permit to be issued by the Central Valley Water Board. Under the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, discharges to all waters of the State, including all wetland and</p>	

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>other waters of the state including, but not limited to, isolated wetlands, are subject to State regulation.</p> <p>For more information on the Water Quality Certification and WDR processes, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:</p> <p>http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/help/business_help/permit2.shtml.</p> <p>Regulatory Compliance for Commercially Irrigated Agriculture</p> <p>If the property will be used for commercial irrigated agriculture, the discharger will be required to obtain regulatory coverage under the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program. There are two options to comply:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Obtain Coverage Under a Coalition Group. Join the local Coalition Group that supports land owners with the implementation of the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program. The Coalition Group conducts water quality monitoring and reporting to the Central Valley Water Board on behalf of its growers. The Coalition Groups charge an annual membership fee, which varies by Coalition Group. To find the Coalition Group in your area, visit the Central Valley Water Board's website at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/irrigated_lands/app_approval/index.shtml; or contact water board staff at (916) 464-4611 or via email at IrrLands@waterboards.ca.gov. 2. Obtain Coverage Under the General Waste Discharge Requirements for Individual Growers, General Order R5-2013-0100. Dischargers not participating in a third-party group (Coalition) are regulated individually. Depending on the specific site conditions, growers may be required to monitor runoff from their property, install monitoring wells, and submit a notice of intent, farm plan, and other action plans regarding their actions to comply with their General Order. Yearly costs would include State administrative fees (for example, annual fees for farm sizes from 10-100 acres are currently \$1,084 + \$6.70/Acre); the cost to prepare annual monitoring reports; and water quality monitoring costs. To enroll as an Individual Discharger under the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program, call the Central Valley Water Board phone line at (916) 464-4611 or e-mail board staff at IrrLands@waterboards.ca.gov. <p>Low or Limited Threat General NPDES Permit</p> <p>If the proposed project includes construction dewatering and it is necessary to discharge the groundwater to waters of the United States, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. Dewatering discharges are typically considered a low or limited threat to water quality and may be covered under the General Order for Dewatering and Other Low Threat Discharges to Surface Waters (Low Threat General Order) or the General Order for Limited Threat Discharges of Treated/Untreated Groundwater from Cleanup Sites, Wastewater from Superchlorination Projects, and Other Limited Threat Wastewaters to Surface Water (Limited Threat General Order). A complete application must be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board to obtain coverage under these General NPDES permits.</p> <p>For more information regarding the Low Threat General Order and the application</p>	

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:</p> <p>http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/general-orders/r5-2013-0074.pdf.</p> <p>For more informational regarding the Limited Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:</p> <p>http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/general-orders/r5-2013-0073.pdf.</p>	
527	1	<p>We write to thank you for providing a 60-day extension to October 30, 2015 to the comment period on the recently released Bay-Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP)/California "WaterFix" and the partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report and Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (RDEIR/SDEIS) and to urge that you provide an additional 60-day extension to December 29, 2015.</p> <p>As you know, the RDEIR/SDEIS contains substantial changes from the initial public draft. The RDEIR/SDEIS amounts to nearly 8,000 pages of additional documentation. Given the size and complexity of the documents, particularly in light of the 40,000 pages associated with the original draft EIR/EIS, which provide the context and foundation for this latest proposal, we strongly believe the current public comment period is inadequate. Affording an additional 60 days, beyond the current review period, is clearly warranted and justified.</p>	<p>To facilitate a more easy review of the changes in the RDEIS/SDEIS compared to the Draft EIR/EIS, a version of the document was made available that included hyperlinks and track changes, in addition to a Section 508-compliant version.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 39 for more information about the public review period.</p>
528	1	<p>The revised draft EIR/EIS for California WaterFix stated in its executive summary that two public hearings would be held regarding the proposed Delta tunnels project. These hearings, however, were transformed by California state officials into public house events, held science fair-style with boards and table displays. This format did not allow for public comments or questions to be addressed in a transparent manner. Even more disturbing, Delta residents were given answers to questions by project consultants regarding water quality and quantity for export through the tunnels that completely contradicts our findings in the DEIR/DEIS and in a presentation given the same day by staff at the Metropolitan Water District [MWD] in Los Angeles. Officials told our members that there would be no water quality impacts and that no additional water would be taken from the Delta, which contradicts the DEIR/DEIS and the MWD Bay-Delta presentation to its board of July 28, 2015.</p> <p>You will find in the video [See ATT1] that our [Restore the Delta] members understand fully the biological underpinnings of how the estuary functions and what it needs for successful restoration. Our supporters understand equally the politics behind California water management. Their knowledge of the impacts of the project and their strong opposition is made clear in the video.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The lead agencies believe that the public outreach and public involvement efforts related to the proposed project more than adequately satisfy the public outreach goals requirements under state and federal laws and guidelines. Please refer to Chapter 28, Environmental Justice, and Chapter 32, Public Involvement, regarding public outreach and language accessibility. Please also refer to Master Response 40 for information about public outreach activities and Master Response 41 regarding transparency and public involvement.</p> <p>CEQA and NEPA do not provide specific requirements regarding the format of a public hearing or public meeting for a Draft EIR/EIS, Recirculated Draft EIR or a Supplemental Draft EIS. Given the level of public interest in the BDCP/California WaterFix and the content of the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS, the lead agencies determined that an open house format, where attendees could discuss specific issues with subject-matter experts, would be the most effective public meeting format. The commenter notes states that contradictory information was provided by different entities affiliated with the project. For clarification of issues related to water quality, the commenter should refer to Chapter 8 of the EIR/EIS. In addition, 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. Additionally, adding intakes in the North</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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> <p>For clarification of issues related to water supplies and exports, please refer to Chapters 5 and 6 of the Final EIR/EIS. In addition, it should be noted that the total amount of water expected to be diverted from the proposed California WaterFix and the existing south Delta facilities is expected to vary depending on hydrologic conditions and the different outflow scenarios modeled for the proposed project.</p>
528	2	<p>[ATT1:]</p> <p>On July 28th, 2015, Restore the Delta brought some of their 25,000 supporters to rally in front of the sham public hearing on the proposed Delta tunnels project, which was held at the Sheraton Grand Sacramento Hotel in Sacramento. More than 300 people from all over Northern California attended, despite this hearing being scheduled on a workday. When agencies promoting the tunnels announced it would be held science-fair style, with no comments in public, just court reporters tucked away in the back, Restore the Delta decided to put the public in this public hearing. The rally intended to transform the open house, and [it] sure did, with peaceful democratic expressions of opposition to the tunnels. And in support of the largest estuary on the West Coast of the Americas.</p>	<p>The commenter raises issues related to the format of the public meetings. The lead agencies believe that the public outreach and public involvement efforts related to the proposed project more than adequately satisfy the public outreach goals requirements under state and federal laws and guidelines. Please refer to Chapter 28, Environmental Justice, and Chapter 32, Public Involvement, regarding public outreach and language accessibility. Please also refer to Master Response 40 for information about public outreach activities and Master Response 41 regarding transparency and public involvement.</p> <p>There is no specific meeting format required under CEQA or NEPA.</p>
528	3	<p>[ATT1:]</p> <p>Here is some of the actual testimony [from the 7/28/2015 public meeting in Sacramento] from residents of the Delta in California who want to protect the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary for our children and future generations.</p> <p>FEMALE SPEAKER: Governor Jerry Brown, short and simple. Stop the tunnels. Save the Delta. Once again, stop the tunnel. Save the Delta.</p> <p>FEMALE SPEAKER: I've been living in the Delta all my life. 35 years ago the California voters denied Governor Brown his peripheral canal.</p> <p>MALE SPEAKER: This is a water plan based on greed, not need, for a handful of the biggest, most powerful corporate agribusinesses, some of whom are big contributors to Jerry Brown.</p> <p>FEMALE SPEAKER: We are completely against these tunnels. All they do is suck the water out of the Delta.</p> <p>MALE SPEAKER: Much of this plan is focused on taking water out of the Delta.</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response 3 for information about the purpose and need for the proposed project. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
528	4	<p>[ATT1:]</p> <p>Here is some of the actual testimony [from the 7/28/2015 public meeting in Sacramento] from residents of the Delta in California who want to protect the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary for our children and future generations.</p> <p>[STOCKTON] VICE MAYOR FUGAZI: We can't afford to have these tunnels. It will absolutely decimate our environment and change the way we live.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need for the proposed project. The purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. The proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please also refer to Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p>
528	5	<p>[ATT1:]</p>	<p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been analyzed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Here is some of the actual testimony [from the 7/28/2015 public meeting in Sacramento] from residents of the Delta in California who want to protect the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary for our children and future generations.</p> <p>MALE SPEAKER: It's just a disaster. A manmade environmental disaster.</p> <p>MALE SPEAKER: I think that California is looking for a quick fix to the (inaudible) problem.</p> <p>FEMALE SPEAKER: It's crazy, and I don't think there's enough we can do to stop it.</p> <p>FEMALE SPEAKER: They've got what we call tunnel vision.</p>	<p>more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need for the proposed project. The purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>
528	6	<p>[ATT1:]</p> <p>Here is some of the actual testimony [from the 7/28/2015 public meeting in Sacramento] from residents of the Delta in California who want to protect the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary for our children and future generations.</p> <p>MALE SPEAKER: I'm a Delta resident. The Delta is an ecological marvel. If you look at Wikipedia for an inverted delta, which our Delta is, there's only a few in the world and ours is the largest.</p> <p>MALE SPEAKER: It's ridiculous to do things like this. It's like destroying your own home.</p> <p>FEMALE SPEAKER: I would just like to go on the record saying that I would hate to see the beautiful Delta being destroyed by the tunnels.</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 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 and the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. 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 for the proposed project.</p>
528	7	<p>[ATT1:]</p> <p>Here is some of the actual testimony [from the 7/28/2015 public meeting in Sacramento] from residents of the Delta in California who want to protect the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary for our children and future generations.</p> <p>MALE SPEAKER: I'm here on behalf of Vista del Lago High School Fishing Club, and I'm here to say that we're totally against the tunnels in the Delta. It's a huge part of high school fishing in California. It's where we hold our state championship and multiple other tournaments. And if we put the tunnels in, we're going to totally ruin the Delta and that wonderful fishery as we know it.</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need of the proposed project. 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.</p>
528	8	<p>[ATT1:]</p> <p>CHIEF CALEEN SISK: I'm from the Winnemem Wintu Tribe in California, and right now the whole Delta plan excludes information about the tribes' villages, burial sites, burial grounds, the areas of impact that will be dug up for these tunnels. The tribes have not been consulted.</p>	<p>The commenter's opinion related to the proposed project is acknowledged. This comment regarding National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 consultation was addressed in the Recirculated DEIR/S through the addition of Section 18.2.1.3, which provides information on Section 106 consultation and development of a Programmatic Agreement as part of a phased approach to identifying cultural resources. Sensitivity assessments also address impacts to unknown (or unevaluated) cultural resources. For additional information about Native American outreach efforts, including identification and analysis of impacts on archaeological sites, Traditional Cultural Properties, and cultural significance of biological resources, please see Master Response 21.</p>
528	9	<p>[ATT1:]</p> <p>Here is some of the actual testimony [from the 7/28/2015 public meeting in Sacramento] from residents of the Delta in California who want to protect the San</p>	<p>The commenter does not raise any issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in 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, and the proposed project is intended to be</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Francisco Bay-Delta estuary for our children and future generations.</p> <p>KATHY MILLER: It's still a deeply flawed plan that wastes billions of taxpayer dollars.</p>	<p>environmentally beneficial.</p>
528	10	<p>[ATT1:]</p> <p>Here is some of the actual testimony [from the 7/28/2015 public meeting in Sacramento] from residents of the Delta in California who want to protect the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary for our children and future generations.</p> <p>MALE SPEAKER: I'm old enough to remember Edmund G. (Pat) Brown and the Northern California water project and that boondoggle sending water south. That pumping has increased. Now these twin tunnels, two 40-foot tunnels that can pump a swimming pool a second, will kill the Delta. This needs to stop.</p>	<p>In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the Final EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the Final EIR/EIS would divert water under existing water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any expansion or reduction of water rights by DWR and Reclamation. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal and State regulating agencies, ESA compliance, and project design. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the Final EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The total amount of water exported by month in each water year type for each action alternative is presented in Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Model Results, of the EIR/EIS. As shown in Appendix 5A, Section C, the north Delta intake tunnels would not be fully utilized except for a few months in wet years. However, it is important to have the maximum capacity in the intakes and tunnels during those periods of time to convey water during extremely wet periods to areas south of the Delta for storage and use during drier times. The north Delta intakes would have minimal flows that would be required for maintenance of the pumps during critical dry years.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in increased water storage, elimination of invasive species including aquatic weeds in the Delta, 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>
528	11	<p>[ATT1:]</p> <p>Here is some of the actual testimony [from the 7/28/2015 public meeting in Sacramento] from residents of the Delta in California who want to protect the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary for our children and future generations.</p> <p>MALE SPEAKER: Corporate agribusiness and oil do not own our water supply. We need to stand in solidarity to say no to the tunnels that will destroy the San Francisco Bay-Delta.</p>	<p>The commenter does not raise any issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</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 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>
528	12	<p>[ATT1:]</p> <p>Here is some of the actual testimony [from the 7/28/2015 public meeting in Sacramento] from residents of the Delta in California who want to protect the San</p>	<p>Please refer to Section 28.3 in Chapter 28, and Chapter 32, Public Involvement, regarding public outreach and language accessibility. Please also refer to Master Response 40 for information about public outreach activities, and Master Response 41 regarding transparency and public involvement. More than 22 scoping meetings occurred between 2008 and 2009. Twelve public meetings occurred in 2014 regarding the Draft EIR/S. Two public meetings occurred in 2015 regarding the RDEIR/SDEIS. Additionally, the following</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Francisco Bay-Delta estuary for our children and future generations.</p> <p>FEMALE SPEAKER: It is insulting to the environmental justice communities to not have the impact report in any other language other than in English.</p>	<p>summary of outreach activities and strategies, consistent with EO 12898 and the obligations described under Section 28.4, Regulatory Setting, including Reclamation's NEPA guidance in the Draft NEPA Handbook requirements, presents how scoping and other outreach considered minority and low-income populations. These activities included the following.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Providing notification and announcements of scoping meetings in ethnic newspapers and on ethnic radio stations. - Conducting scoping meetings within affected communities during evening hours in an effort to involve low-income and minority communities outside of working hours. - Providing translators at public scoping meetings. - Providing the BDCP project Website in Spanish. - Providing a multi-lingual information hotline for project information in English, Spanish, Tagalog, Vietnamese, or Chinese (Mandarin).
528	13	<p>[ATT1:]</p> <p>Here is some of the actual testimony [from the 7/28/2015 public meeting in Sacramento] from residents of the Delta in California who want to protect the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary for our children and future generations.</p> <p>MALE SPEAKER: Construction will have major impacts in the Delta all the way from Courtland to Stockton.</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issues related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Construction-related impacts are discussed 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.</p>
528	14	<p>[ATT1:]</p> <p>And it's really a water grab by big money [agriculture] interests and also Southern California. They want to take our fresh Sacramento water, and we're going to take all the impact.</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 Responses 34 (Beneficial Uses), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>
528	15	<p>[ATT1:]</p> <p>Here is some of the actual testimony [from the 7/28/2015 public meeting in Sacramento] from residents of the Delta in California who want to protect the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary for our children and future generations.</p> <p>FEMALE SPEAKER: How can we protect the fish if we take even more water? It seems like the tunnels are a bad idea for all of California.</p> <p>MALE SPEAKER: The animals, the fish, the birds, they all depend on us. We are the species with the ability to think, and they are counting on us for their survival.</p> <p>FEMALE SPEAKER: What plans do they have to mitigate the damage to the wildlife and fish that's going to be destroyed while they're building these tunnels?</p>	<p>Chapter 11 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect fish. Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect birds and other 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.</p>
528	16	<p>[ATT1:]</p> <p>Here is some of the actual testimony [from the 7/28/2015 public meeting in Sacramento] from residents of the Delta in California who want to protect the San</p>	<p>In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the Final EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the Final EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Francisco Bay-Delta estuary for our children and future generations.</p> <p>MALE SPEAKER: These tunnels will not create one new drop of water for California. It will just divert it from one of the most ecologically sensitive and unique water systems in all of the United States.</p>	<p>issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal and State regulating agencies, ESA compliance, and project design. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods to improve ecosystem conditions in the Delta.</p>
528	17	<p>[ATT1:]</p> <p>Here is some of the actual testimony [from the 7/28/2015 public meeting in Sacramento] from residents of the Delta in California who want to protect the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary for our children and future generations.</p> <p>FEMALE SPEAKER: Jerry Brown, by destroying one fragile ecosystem, you will mess up the environment for all of us.</p> <p>FEMALE SPEAKER: Please, look in your heart. Don't look at the money. Look at the people. Look at the fish. Look at the birds.</p>	<p>The commenter does not raise any issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
528	18	<p>[ATT1:]</p> <p>Here is some of the actual testimony [from the 7/28/2015 public meeting in Sacramento] from residents of the Delta in California who want to protect the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary for our children and future generations.</p> <p>MALE SPEAKER: It just keeps coming back and back and back. I thought we cut off its head last time, but it's back again. And we're going to have to take this to the voters because the voters of California, they're going to see right through it.</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
528	19	<p>[ATT1:]</p> <p>Here is some of the actual testimony [from the 7/28/2015 public meeting in Sacramento] from residents of the Delta in California who want to protect the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary for our children and future generations.</p> <p>FEMALE SPEAKER: I'm from Clarksburg, California which is the bull's eye of the BDCP plan. We're asking Governor Brown today to do the right thing and not forsake multigenerational farmland.</p> <p>FEMALE SPEAKER: And protect our Delta.</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any specific environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. With regard to the comment about farmland, please refer to Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, of the Final EIR/EIS.</p>
528	20	<p>[ATT1:]</p> <p>Here is some of the actual testimony [from the 7/28/2015 public meeting in Sacramento] from residents of the Delta in California who want to protect the San</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response 3 for more information about purpose and need for the proposed project.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Francisco Bay-Delta estuary for our children and future generations.</p> <p>MALE SPEAKER: Conservation is terrific. We should have been doing it years ago. But if we all save all of the water that the Governor has asked, it's less than we're sending to almonds in California. And for what? These almonds are going overseas for the most part. They're benefiting very few people. We have to straighten out our priorities. Stop sending water to almonds, and start saving the fish.</p>	
529	1	<p>This is my letter to inform you of my opposition to the twin tunnel project. As a voter of over fifty years I think this is a costly mistake for us seniors and other voters. We need to be thinking about more dams for our state and to continue our water conservation without penalties.</p>	<p>It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 (Demand Management) for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project. Although many of the proposed alternatives included meritorious water policy principles, the proposals rejected by the Lead Agencies did not qualify as appropriate alternatives for various reasons. For example, proposals were rejected because they were inconsistent with the project's objectives and purpose and need or included components that are beyond the scope of the project. The text of the Draft EIR/EIS in Chapter 3 (section 3.2) and Appendix 3A to that document thoroughly explain the process used to develop the alternatives, and explain why certain potential alternatives were considered but ultimately rejected by the Lead Agencies</p> <p>Please also refer to Master Responses 4 (Alternatives) and Master Response 37 (Water Storage).</p>
531	1	<p>The Bay Delta Conservation Plan BDCP/WaterFix or water tunnels continues to be pushed by Governor Jerry Brown; Department of Water Resources; Westlands, Kern, [and] Metropolitan Water Districts; big agribusiness; and oil frackers. Despite widespread criticism by California residents, many environmental groups, and [the] Environmental Protection Agency, the water tunnels are being forced on California and if approved, construction could begin as early as 2016. Why are the tunnels a mistake? Two 40-foot-diameter tunnels dug 150 feet below the Sacramento River, 35 miles long, pumping water south, spells disaster and ruin for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and San Francisco Bay Estuary. We already are sending water south from the Delta via [two] California aqueducts. The new system would give Westlands, Kern, and Metropolitan Water Districts, in conjunction with big agribusiness and big oil frackers, a monopoly on California water to control and make enormous profit from this precious natural resource which belongs to all Californians. The BDCP/WaterFix is water-grabbing thievery by the State of California to sell Sacramento River water, a product of many rivers, to a few individuals who will control and make enormous profit. If allowed, the water tunnels will destroy the Delta and San Francisco Bay. Construction would take many years and cost billions and billions of dollars to be paid, in the end, by California taxpayers for generations to come. Restore and maintain the present water distribution system with better regulation by the state. No water tunnels, no water blunders.</p>	<p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. For more information regarding MWD Water Supply please see Master Response 35.</p>
531	2	<p>I am praying the BDCP/California WaterFix is struck down once and for all. Let us focus on projects which are logical, doable, and beneficial for the whole state now and in the future. Please do not undertake this ill-conceived project, with common sense, which would destroy California's large and vital inland waterway.</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. It is important to note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>state-wide solution to all of California's water problems.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.</p>
532	1	<p>On behalf of the United Chambers of Commerce, I would like to provide the following comments on the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix (BDCP/WaterFix) and its recirculated draft environmental impact statement/report released on July 10, 2015.</p> <p>California WaterFix represents the efforts of federal and state agencies for the past nine years to find a lasting water system/ecosystem solution for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. Water supplies originating in the Sierra Nevada pass through the Delta and must be reliably captured and transported in order to sustain the California economy and directly provide supplies to two-thirds of the state's residents and 3 million acres of the most productive farmland in the nation.</p>	<p>This comment is consistent with the fundamental purpose of the project to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta, water supplies of the SWP and CVP for users located south of the Delta, Delta water quality, and Delta habitat, as described in Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need, of the EIR/S.</p>
532	2	<p>[The United Chambers of Commerce -- San Fernando Valley and Region's] understanding is that the preferred alternative, as detailed in Alternative 4A within the recirculated documents, is largely consistent with the proposal in the public draft documents released in December 2013. Three new intakes would be constructed in the northern Delta along the Sacramento River, with the supply transported via a twin tunnel pipeline system to the existing aqueducts in the southern Delta for the State Water Project and Central Valley Project. The reliability of supplies would be shored up in average rain years, with higher supplies available than now in wetter years. This remains a workable framework</p>	<p>The issues raised by the commenters address the merits of the project. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
532	3	<p>California WaterFix remains a work in progress, with plans for a final plan and funding decisions by public water agencies sometime next year. The importance of this water supply for Southern California and all of the state, however, is clear and beyond dispute. Southern California's drought survival strategy depends on capturing adequate State Water Project supplies in wet periods and to store them in reservoirs and groundwater basins for dry years. The existing decades-old water systems in the Delta can no longer reliably perform this vital function and is also at risk of prolonged outages due to seismic events along with Delta levee collapse. California WaterFix would re-establish the ability to capture water for drought cycles and protect the supply from natural disasters.</p>	<p>This comment is consistent with the fundamental purpose of the project to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta, water supplies of the SWP and CVP for users located south of the Delta, Delta water quality, and Delta habitat, as described in Section 2.3 of Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need, of the EIR/EIS.</p>
532	4	<p>[The United Chambers of Commerce -- San Fernando Valley and Region] embraces the "all of the above" approach to maintaining a reliable water system in Southern California. Our region needs enhanced conservation and more local supplies such as recycling to meet the challenges of population growth and shifting climate patterns. Yet this robust portfolio approach can only succeed with a reliable supply from the State Water Project. Its high source quality is essential for recycling the supply. It is an essential baseline. And it is the stored supplies for drought cycles.</p>	<p>This comment is consistent with the fundamental purpose of the project to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta, water supplies of the SWP and CVP for users located south of the Delta, Delta water quality, and Delta habitat, as described in Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need, of the EIR/S. 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>
532	5	<p>Public water agencies such as the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California will need to [build] a solid business case when assessing the final proposal to make this historic investment. Given the length of this historic process and the limited duration of the current federal administration, time is of the essence to make all necessary</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. Please also refer to Master Response 5 regarding costs and funding.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		decisions to craft a final plan by next year. [The United Chambers of Commerce -- San Fernando Valley and Region] hopes our comments are helpful in making the final California WaterFix plan a historic achievement for the state environment and economy.	
533	1	I have lived on the banks of Steamboat Slough on Ryer Island since 1962, and have witnessed the continuing degradation of the Delta and its unique ecosystem. It is plain to all, that there is not enough water in the Sacramento/San Joaquin River system to support existing and future water demands, while also providing for the natural habitat and ecosystem.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation would be able to pump from the proposed north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design. Operations for the proposed project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S. In addition to permitting constraints on daily operations of the SWP and CVP, DWR and Reclamation must maintain proper performance and bypass flows across fish screens when endangered and threatened fish species are present within the north Delta facilities area. The intake fish screens drive the overall size of the intake structure on the riverbank, and have been numbered and sized to permit water to flow through the screens within a predetermined flow regime set by California Department of Fish and Wildlife and NMFS fish screen criteria.</p> <p>The proposed project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the proposed project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative. It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under the proposed project as compared to exports under No Action Alternative based on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. Although long-term total exports under the proposed project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p>
533	2	In recent years the Delta has become infested with non-native aquatic weeds that are choking channels and impacting water quality. It is my belief that the dramatic increase in undesirable non-native vegetation has been caused, in part, by the lack of stream flow -- in recent times the rivers ran vigorously during the winter months, thereby flushing out much of the unwanted growth. Today, Steamboat Slough acts as a tidal slough year round -- where in past years in flowed in direction (toward the ocean) for ½ of the year. Drought and increased demands (and diversions) are the likely culprit.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
533	3	The EIR/EIS fails to adequately assess the economic and environmental impacts to the Delta region caused by the construction project. Local communities such as Hood, Courtland, and Walnut Grove will experience extensive and extended impacts caused by ongoing construction -- spanning many years.	Socioeconomic effects regarding changes to community character are discussed in Impact ECON-3 under each alternative in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics. Effects associated with construction activities could result in changes to community cohesion if they were to restrict mobility, reduce opportunities for maintaining face-to-face relationships, or disrupt the functions of community organizations or community gathering places (such as schools, libraries, places of worship, and recreational facilities). Under Alternative 4A, several gathering places that lie in the vicinity of construction areas could be indirectly affected by noise and traffic associated with construction activities, including Delta High School, the Clarksburg Library, Clarksburg Community Church, Resurrection Life Community Church, Citizen Land Alliance, Discovery Bay Chamber of

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Commerce, Courtland Fire Department, and several marinas or other recreational facilities (see Chapter 15, Recreation, Table 15-15). Implementation of mitigation measures and environmental commitments related to noise, visual effects, transportation, agriculture, and recreation, would reduce adverse effects (see Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs).</p> <p>However, the proposed project would also result in some positive effects. As discussed under Impact ECON-1, construction of the water conveyance facilities would be anticipated to result in a net temporary increase of income and employment in the Delta region. Construction-related employment from the project is estimated to peak at 2,427 FTE jobs in year 3. Total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) would peak in year 12, at 8,673 FTE jobs. Direct agricultural employment would be reduced by an estimated 16 FTE jobs, while total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) associated with agricultural employment would fall by 57 FTE jobs. Throughout the five-county Delta region, population and employment would expand as a result of the construction of water conveyance facilities, as discussed under Impacts ECON-1 and ECON-2. Under Alternative 4A, additional regional employment and income could create net positive effects on the character of Delta communities.</p>
536	1	<p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Delta tunnels plan.</p> <p>I am a licensed civil engineer so I know a little bit about project environmental impacts as well as the effects of stream and river flows on the surrounding areas. My family and I also happen to frequent the delta region for the past 20 years specifically Sherman Island so we have a pretty good sense of the changes over these last 20 years. We have seen firsthand what the drought is doing to this region with the reduction of fresh water flows through the Delta rivers and streams. The Delta tunnels project will clearly do nothing to help the current situation and most surely exacerbate it.</p> <p>It is a project that will have significant short- and long-term detrimental environmental effects on a significant portion of the San Francisco Bay Delta. We have already seen significant changes over time due to reduced fresh water flows including the water having more salinity along with more salt water fish, less clarity, occurrences of toxic blue-green algae as well as population explosions of hyacinth in the water further impacting water quality, habitat and health.</p>	<p>The issues raised by the commenter address the merits of the project and do not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS.</p>
536	2	<p>With the tunnels, water flow through the Delta is further reduced thus increasing already harmful consequences of reduced fresh water flows. Two fish releases are being constructed in this vicinity which will too be further negatively impacted, reducing the chances of freshwater fish survival. These observations can be verified by the county park hosts as well as the multitude of water enthusiasts that frequent the Sacramento county park known as the Sherman Island fishing access located just south of Rio Vista, California.</p>	<p>With respect to effects of Alternative 4A on aquatic resources, please see Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Resources, which indicates that there would be no adverse effects of Alternative 4A on fish and aquatic resources. The authors are unable to understand the term “Two fish releases are being constructed in this vicinity” and, therefore, cannot respond to this part of the comment. A cumulative effects analysis on fish and aquatic resources, which includes project effects in combination with all federal actions, can be found in Chapter 11, Section 11.4.5, Cumulative Effects of the Action Alternatives.</p>
536	3	<p>The tunnel project does nothing to preserve and protect the levees that currently move the water supply while preserving the current eco system. The tunnel project also does nothing remotely to address sustainability but rather the opposite. What happens when more water is needed [or] longer, bigger, and more tunnels? It has been mentioned that the tunnels will ensure the delivery of water in case of an earthquake where the levees may not hold; however, it would be far less expensive and have less negative environmental impacts to reinforce existing levees as we are currently doing. More funding can too go into water conversation education [and] incentives promoting a much more sustainable approach to water management.</p>	<p>Please see Chapter 2, FEIR/EIS, for the BDCP/CWF purpose and need, and Appendix 6A Sections 6A.2 and 6A.3 for discussion on existing levee improvement programs and funding mechanisms, which would not be affected by the BDCP/CWF. Levees are an important public safety resource and the proposed project would not change levee policy or replace ongoing programs and grant projects aimed at facilitating and supporting levee improvements in or outside the Delta. It recognized that levee maintenance and safety in the Delta is an important issue for the residents of the Delta and for statewide interests.</p> <p>Also, see Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, FEIR/EIS, for an overview of water use efficiency and conservation programs being implemented to reduce water demand throughout the state. Demand Management is not a BDCP/CWF Alternative as it does not meet the Purpose and Need for the BDCP/CWF to</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			improve habitat for at risk fish species and increase water supply reliability.
536	4	Short-term impacts of a construction project this size would require a significant amount of environmental mitigation because of the destruction of sensitive lands to accommodate the tunnel along its path, as well as for other impacted areas for construction staging [and] places to deposit the massive amounts of dirt to accommodate the tunnels. These costs are often underestimated in the planning stages. And on large projects such as this, costs are underestimated even more since there are usually unforeseen environmentally and culturally sensitive discoveries during construction. This will require not only additional attention and resources to address, but more importantly they cause significant delays as well as increased (unbudgeted) capital costs for added mitigation.	The estimated costs of mitigation associated with the impacts of the construction of the water conveyance facility are described in detail in Chapter 8 of the public draft BDCP EIR/EIS released in December 2013. These costs have been revised and updated since then as the proposed water conveyance facility design has been optimized. Please refer to Exhibit E of Design and Construction Enterprise Draft Agreement released by DWR on January 15, 2016 ("2081/Section 7 Mitigation Cost Estimate" Table) for a current accounting of estimated mitigation costs. These costs include a conservative contingency of 35% to account for cost uncertainties.
536	5	It is not only surprising but frustrating that our current governor, who promotes pro-environmental efforts such as initiatives to reduce greenhouse gases, is also supporting the tunnel plan that has so many significant detrimental environmental effects.	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.
536	6	Water is a finite resource. Please consider solutions to our water problems that are sustainable, more environmentally prudent and less destructive and costly.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Operations for the proposed project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S. In addition to permitting constraints on daily operations of the SWP and CVP, DWR and Reclamation must maintain proper performance and bypass flows across fish screens when endangered and threatened fish species are present within the north Delta facilities area. The intake fish screens drive the overall size of the intake structure on the riverbank, and have been numbered and sized to permit water to flow through the screens within a predetermined flow regime set by California Department of Fish and Wildlife and NMFS fish screen criteria.</p> <p>The proposed project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the proposed project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative. It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under the proposed project as compared to exports under No Action Alternative based on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. Although long-term total exports under the proposed project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p>
537	1	<p>I would like to respectfully suggest that instead of thinking up new ways to divert Bay Delta Waters, or improving existing delivery systems, more time and effort should be spent on developing desalination projects up and down the California coast.</p> <p>Desalination is the only new source of fresh water available to the state.</p> <p>Improving the current aqueduct system or building new dams and reservoirs is not developing new sources, and in fact continues to rely on snow and rainfall that we are not getting.</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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		I fully realize that desalination is not a perfect solution, but when you think about the consequences of running out of fresh water, it looks pretty good.	<p>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 see Master Response 7 regarding desalination.</p>
539	1	I write because I am strongly against the Delta Tunnels plan. I am extremely concerned by the negative impact these tunnels would have on native wildlife that depend on the Delta's freshwater and migrating species (chinook, salmon, etc) that will be harmed by reduced water flow in the Delta. These migrating species, in turn, are important food sources for marine wildlife, including South Pacific Puget Sound Orcas. This in turn will damage California's fishing industry and wildlife/bird watching in the Delta.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
539	2	Instead of spending billions on these ill-conceived tunnels, we should work to, among other things, conserve more water, fund water recycling and groundwater recharging projects and retire damaged or polluted farmland in the south San Joaquin Valley. We must learn from Australia's drought - which citizens beat with conservation and low-tech methods, not pricey infrastructure projects or high tech fixes.	<p>Although components such as desalination plants and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. It is important to note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage.</p> <p>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.</p>
541	1	<p>Description of the Comprehensive Water Plan for California</p> <p>I am proposing a "Comprehensive Water Plan for Californians (all inclusive)" that will provide an environmentally sound solution for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta which will accomplish the following objectives at a cost far less than the currently proposed twin tunnels plan. The objective here is to only focus on the alternative proposal that will serve all Californians including the Delta environmental habitat and will:</p> <p>Vastly augment the water supply via savings of the major amount of freshwater with a Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) in the amount less than 100 mg/lit [milligrams per liter] (or 100 parts per million, PPM) being currently wasted into the sea by creating hydraulic</p>	Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. Although conservation components and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including storm water drainage. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>barrier against salty seawater with a the TDS amounts nearly 40,000 mg/lit. The TDS amounts mentioned above (30,000 mg/lit and 200 mg/lit) of the freshwater saving during dry and critical water years (such as the current condition) is estimated to be nearly 2 million acre-feet per year (equivalent of more than twice the total capacity of Folsom Lake or more than 50% the full capacity of the SWP's total yield during wet years. This study is based on the DWR data and estimates of the Net Delta Outflow of 267,683 acre-feet and Sacramento River flow of 427,327 acre-feet during the period covering May 20, 2015 through June 18, 2015.</p>	<p>Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p>
541	2	<p>Description of the Comprehensive Water Plan for California</p> <p>I am proposing a "Comprehensive Water Plan for Californians (all inclusive)" that will provide an environmentally sound solution for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta which will accomplish the following objectives at a cost far less than the currently proposed twin tunnels plan. The objective here is to only focus on the alternative proposal that will serve all Californians including the Delta environmental habitat and will:</p> <p>Prevent water quality degradation by reducing the amount of seawater intrusion into the</p> <p>Delta via adjusting the size of the opening channel right at the source, mouth of Delta, that will transfer the saltwater and freshwater mixing zone westward towards the Bay while preserving a healthy transition from freshwater to saltwater vital for the fish life and migration and Delta environment.</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> <p>For more information regarding alternatives to the proposed project please see Master Response 4.</p>
541	3	<p>Description of the Comprehensive Water Plan for California</p> <p>I am proposing a "Comprehensive Water Plan for Californians (all inclusive)" that will provide an environmentally sound solution for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta which will accomplish the following objectives at a cost far less than the currently proposed twin tunnels plan. The objective here is to only focus on the alternative proposal that will serve all Californians including the Delta environmental habitat and will:</p> <p>Increase water levels adjacent to the proposed hydraulic structures at the Delta side to prevent seawater intrusion into the Delta due to projected sea level rises.</p>	<p>The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of one particular water supply augmentation approach (presumably referring to greater storage within the Delta) 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 and 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>
541	4	<p>Description of the Comprehensive Water Plan for California</p> <p>I am proposing a "Comprehensive Water Plan for Californians (all inclusive)" that will provide an environmentally sound solution for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta which will accomplish the following objectives at a cost far less than the currently proposed twin tunnels plan. The objective here is to only focus on the alternative proposal that will serve all Californians including the Delta environmental habitat and</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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>will:</p> <p>Increase safety controls during catastrophic events such as earth quakes that can cause levee breaks or tsunamis which would create inundation of major part of the Delta by saltwater that could damage the Delta and indefinitely interrupt the water supply for most of Californians.</p>	<p>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 California Water Plan’s strategies are to be considered tools in a toolkit for water managers to choose from with the understanding that regional and local water managers have the best perspective on which strategy or strategies are most cost-effective and productive for meeting the needs and priorities of their region. For more information on the California Water Plan see Draft EIR/EIS, Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 (Alternatives) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) for additional information regarding the development and scoping of the project’s preferred alternative.</p>
541	5	<p>This proposal for a Comprehensive Water Plan for Californians is based on installing a set of hydraulic structures of different and adjustable openings at the mouth of Delta, vicinity of Carquinez Bridge, that will:</p> <p>Provide freely and continuous fish travel but controlled and adjustable water flow in either direction, seaward and landward, through adjustable openings within the proposed hydraulic gates.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed. The proposed project is just one element of the state’s long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including storm water drainage. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California’s water resources.</p>
541	6	<p>This proposal for a Comprehensive Water Plan for Californians is based on installing a set of hydraulic structures of different and adjustable openings at the mouth of Delta, vicinity of Carquinez Bridge, that will:</p> <p>Include controlled passage for ships and navigation in either direction.</p>	<p>The commenter does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
541	7	<p>This proposal for a Comprehensive Water Plan for Californians is based on installing a set of hydraulic structures of different and adjustable openings at the mouth of Delta, vicinity of Carquinez Bridge, that will:</p> <p>Cost far less than the \$15.5 billion estimated cost for the 30 miles of twin tunnels.</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. 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 refer to Master Response 3 for information on the purpose and need for the 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>
541	8	<p>This proposal for a Comprehensive Water Plan for Californians is based on installing a set of hydraulic structures of different and adjustable openings at the mouth of Delta, vicinity of Carquinez Bridge, that will:</p> <p>[Allow] totally unrestricted flow of water and navigation in either direction during the wet season or any time deemed necessary.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed. The proposed project is just one element of the state’s long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including storm water drainage. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California’s water resources.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
541	9	I strongly urge you, Governor Brown, to reconsider the twin tunnel idea and allow me to present my idea of fixing the Delta and saving all Californians both from the southern and northern part of the state both environmentally and financially.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
541	10	[ATT1: Google map of placement of proposed location of Dr. Ali's hydraulic structure near Carquinez Bridge]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
541	11	[ATT2: Summary of Qalifications [for] Ali Ghorbanzadeh (Alan Gorban), Ph.D., P.E.]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
541	12	[ATT3: Adjustable hydraurlic structure proposal near Carquinez Bridge is California's lifeline prevention from a water armageddon. Comments captured in letter.]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
542	1	[ATT1] http://www.sacbee.com/news/article36520809.html Investors mine for water, the next hot commodity, Sacramento Bee, September 25, 2015	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
542	2	Attached is a photo of Folsom Dam as of September 17th, 2015 [See ATT3]. It may already be too late to save our water supply. We need to get moving fast and need your help and support.	<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. The EIR/EIS analysis did not evaluate emergency operations conditions such as during the recent drought because separate environmental documentation is prepared for those conditions.</p> <p>The SWP and CVP operations under the action alternatives would only deliver water under existing water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board to DWR and Reclamation for use by the SWP and CVP with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities, including operations to protect water quality, can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html).</p>
542	3	Adjustable hydraulic structure proposal near Carquinez Bridge is California's lifeline prevention from a Water Armageddon Read More: Constricting the mouth of the Delta will bring in approximately 250% (two-and-half times) the current State Water Project allocation of fresh water, bring more consistency and reliability to our water supply, increased water quality, safer for the environment, and a fraction of the time and cost to build compared to the Twin	Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including storm water drainage. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Tunnels.</p> <p>This alternative proposal to the Twin Tunnels water plan will increase the State's water supply by approximately 2,000,000 (two-million) acre-ft/year or 250% two-and-half times more than the current State Water Project allocation of 840,000 acre-ft fresh water for all Californians that was increased March 2, 2015.</p>	
542	4	[ATT2: Reservoir Conditions - Folsom Lake]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
542	5	[ATT3: Photo of Folsom Dam/Lake, September 17, 2015]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
543	1	Please do not let this happen. I am totally against it.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
544	1	We want to state our disapproval and vote against the Delta tunnels. This would be a giant and irreversible mistake for the State to pursue. Our continued manipulation of the environment only shows that humans are clever, not intelligent. We must protect this Earth.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
545	1	I think the Bay Delta Conservation Plan should not go forward as it will divert even more water from the Delta and cause even more environmental harm. Too much water is already being diverted from our rivers and delta [smelt] and salmon populations are crashing and the Delta has salt water intrusion. Conservation and much more efficient use of agricultural water is a much better and much cheaper option.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities, including operations to protect water quality, can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html).</p> <p>The proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and 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>The proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
547	1	<p>We write to urge you to provide an additional 60-day extension to the comment period on the recently released Bay-Delta Conservation plan (BDCP)/California "WaterFix" and the partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report and Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (RDEIR/SDEIS) to December 29, 2015.</p> <p>We appreciate the recent 60-day extension to October 30, 2015, but as you know, the RDEIR/SDEIS contains substantial changes from the initial public draft. The RDEIR/SDEIS amounts to nearly 8,000 pages of additional documentation. Additionally, we have been informed that the responsible agency will not consider any of our previous comments applicable to the new alternatives, despite the many similarities. As a result, we are faced with cross-referencing all of the previous comments to ensure that the responsible agency is fully aware of all our concerns.</p> <p>Given the size and complexity of the documents, particularly in light of the 40,000 pages associated with the original draft EIR/EIS, and the need to cross-reference previously submitted comments, we strongly believe the current public comment period is inadequate. Affording an additional 60 days, beyond the current review period is clearly warranted and justified.</p>	<p>To facilitate a more easy review of the changes in the RDEIS/SDEIS compared to the Draft EIR/EIS, a version of the document was made available that included hyperlinks and track changes, in addition to a Section 508-compliant version.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 39 for more information about the public review period.</p> <p>For more information regarding public comment responses please see Master Response 42.</p>
548	1	<p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Delta Tunnels plan. The so-called "California WaterFix" will not produce more water, create more reliable supplies or improve environmental conditions in the Delta. Instead it will unacceptably jeopardize the existence of endangered salmon runs and other native fish populations in the Sacramento River and Bay-Delta estuary.</p>	<p>As a plan prepared to meet the standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p>
548	2	<p>The WaterFix fails to meet the restoration goals of the Delta Reform Act of 2009, in which the California state legislature committed to the "coequal goals" of providing a more reliable water supply for the state while protecting and restoring the Delta's cultural, recreational, natural resource and agricultural values. The WaterFix is simply a plan to export more water out of the Bay-Delta estuary. The Delta Tunnels will not provide more reliable water because the Delta watershed is already oversubscribed by five times in normal water years.</p>	<p>The EIR/EIS was prepared in a manner so as to comply with the 2009 Delta Reform Act, including sections that are mentioned in this response, as</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 31 for details regarding the Delta Plan and the BDCP or preferred alternative 4A.</p> <p>. Notably, nothing in the Delta Reform Act requires each and every project consistent with the Delta Reform Act or the Delta Stewardship Council's Delta Plan to fully meet each and every statutory purpose or each and every policy within the Delta Plan, provided that any such project does not thwart or undermine the pursuit of such statutory or regulatory policies.</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. Senior water rights holders are not affected by implementation of the action alternatives.</p> <p>The amount of water DWR 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 FWS (2008) and NMFS (2009) BiOps 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 the 2008 and 2009 BiOps (RDEIR/SDEIS Executive Summary ES.2.2). In addition to permitting constraints on daily operations of the SWP and CVP,</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>DWR must maintain proper performance and bypass flows across fish screens when endangered and threatened fish species are present within the north Delta facilities area. The intake fish screens drive the overall size of the intake structure on the riverbank, and have been numbered and sized to permit water to flow through the screens within a predetermined flow regime set by California Department of Fish and Wildlife and NMFS fish screen criteria (BDCP Appendix 5B Section 3.B.3.3).</p> <p>The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of an expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead a much more limited endeavor 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 not intended to serve as a statewide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management). Changes in water deliveries and surface water flows in the Sacramento Valley under the action alternatives as compared to the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative are presented in Chapter 5 and Appendix 5A of the EIR/EIS; and associated changes in aquatic resources along the Sacramento River are presented in Chapter 11 of the EIR/EIS.</p>
548	3	Far less expensive and less environmentally destructive alternatives to the Delta Tunnels were largely ignored -- alternatives that would save taxpayers billions of dollars, while investing in the jobs and local water sources that build sustainability. The plan does not seriously consider any alternatives other than new, upstream conveyance. And the decision-making process has tilted in favor of increasing Delta water exports. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject this harmful project.	<p>The Proposed Project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the Proposed Project would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p> <p>Fifteen alternatives and 3 additional subalternatives were analyzed in the EIR/S and the RDEIR/RSEIS respectively. Four major alignments have been included in the EIR/S: Through-Delta, East of the Sacramento River, West of the Sacramento River, and a Tunnel under the Delta. Many additional proposals by public and private individuals and organizations have also been evaluated and described in Chapter 3 of the EIR/S and Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1. A great deal of public input, then, informed the formulation of alternatives. Notably, the commenter has not mentioned any specific potentially feasible alternatives that "would save taxpayers billions of dollars, while investing in the jobs and local water sources that build sustainability."</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.</p>
552	1	<p>Stop stealing California's water.</p> <p>Stop lying about weather modifications.</p> <p>Stop taking our money and not protecting and cleaning our water. Your report [is so long], you make it so no one out here in the world will want to take the time to read it.</p> <p>You do nothing to support and help your fellow human, you lie, cheat, steal, and</p>	<p>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>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>demand payment.</p> <p>I do not consent.</p> <p>I do not consent.</p> <p>I do not consent.</p> <p>Clean up the water.</p> <p>Let there be a balanced, fair way to give everyone the water they need. Be truthful in your dealings. Treat us like you want to be treated.</p>	
553	1	<p>I am appalled at the gall of our Governor saying he is saving the Delta, destroy yes, save the Delta no. The only way to stop the encroachment of salt water coming up the Delta is by having sufficient water flow, period. Putting a rock dam across the river assuring salt water cannot contaminate water being shipped to the south but destroying the land around the Delta. This was not by accident that this dam was placed where it is, thus assuring that water supply would be the last area to be contaminated by salt water. Governor, you sir are a liar when saying saving the Delta is a priority; getting water to southern corporate farmers and Los Angeles over the dead bodies of central California is your priority. Nothing is being done about desalination plants which will be just as costly as the twin tunnels fiasco with a never ending supply of water. Your [bullying of] the citizens of the Central Valley shows again your ignorance of the lasting effects this will have for hundreds of years.</p>	<p>Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
554	1	<p>The tunnel project would be the ruin of the Sacramento Delta. Balances between salt and fresh water levels are already critical, endangering plants, animals, fish and farm land if more salt water is allowed to intrude. Damages from the drought are bad enough. Please retract your plan as it would damage us far more.</p>	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 14 (Water Quality).</p>
555	1	<p>We own a family ranch in Merced County and have used water from Delta Mendota canal; but not in the summer of 2015. The water fix does zero to assist with water for small ranchers/farmers near Gustine, off I-5.</p>	<p>The water supply analysis addresses changes to water supply to SWP and CVP water users in the Delta region, upstream of the Delta Region, and Export Service Areas due to implementation of the Proposed Project conveyance facilities (CM1) and other conservation measures (HCP/NCCP alternatives), specifically tidal marsh habitat restoration (CM4). Consistent with previous modeling analyses conducted by DWR and Reclamation, including the 2008 Biological Assessment on the Continued Long-Term Operations of the Central Valley Project and State Water Project, the modeling analyses presented in this section assumed that the SWP and CVP were solely responsible for providing any needed water for implementation of the Proposed Project. The alternatives would not modify water deliveries to non-SWP and non-CVP water rights holders, including in-Delta water rights holders. Therefore, the water supply analysis addresses impacts to DWR, Reclamation, and SWP water users and CVP water service contractors, as opposed to other water rights holders, as the Proposed Project does not include any regulatory actions that would affect water availability to any such water rights holders. Please see Master Response 26 regarding Delta exports, area of origin protections and existing water rights.</p>
555	2	<p>These tunnels are very expensive; there is no certainty they will be efficient and work as the promoters say they will. Billions of dollars for a project that is 50/50 at best in working. Have you looked at the tunnels themselves-how will they be maintained? How can they be repaired if water flows uncontrollably through them? How will the wildlife (fish, mammals, birds, etc.) that are endangered species be looked after or</p>	<p>The proposed project is costly, but the Lead Agencies have assessed the benefits as described in the funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those facilities. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on project costs and funding.</p> <p>Maintenance requirements for the tunnels have not yet been finalized. Some of the critical considerations in</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		considered for protection?	<p>terms of maintenance include evaluating whether the tunnels need to be taken out of service for inspection and, if so, how frequently this is required. Typically, new water conveyance tunnels are inspected at least every 10 years for the first 50 years and more frequently thereafter. Maintenance activities are expected to include, at a minimum, periodic inspection of the tunnels by remotely operated vehicles and removal of sediment that accumulates in the tunnels.</p> <p>The Proposed Project has been developed with the goals of minimizing and avoiding incidental take of listed species to the maximum extent practicable. Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 12, Terrestrial Biological Resources, EIR/EIS, describe effects of the proposed project and several alternatives on fish and wildlife species in the Plan Area. Where the alternative does not include preparation of an HCP, ESA compliance for construction and operation of water intakes in the north Delta and associated conveyance facilities would be achieved solely through Section 7. For more information please see Section 3.2.4 in the FEIR/EIS.</p>
555	3	There are many ranchers/farmers who have been in the Delta area for nearly two hundred years whose lives & land will be uprooted forever if this project was moved forward.....That is not right!	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.
556	1	Please do not destroy the delta by building tunnels. It will decimate our water and destroy the 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.
556	2	Build a new desalinization instead. It makes more sense.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
557	1	<p>We live on the Calaveras River and are opposed to the tunnels as they would disrupt much of our valuable farm land and create an unbelievable environmental hazard. The salinity levels that have increased in the Stockton area will only climb higher when the water is diverted from Courtland to the canal system.</p> <p>Our Delta is a precious gift from God and needs to be protected.</p>	<p>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p>
558	1	Prior to moving forward with the WaterFix Tunnels plan, please consider the fact that these multibillion-dollar monstrosities fail to increase any water supply and will devastate an already fragile Delta Ecosystem. Additionally thousands of acres of farmland would be taken out of production in the Delta region. This plan will potentially impair properties around the entire region through eminent domain. Please keep in mind that it is agriculture that drives the California economic engine.	<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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <p>Please see RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, Impact AG-1 and Impact AG-2 and their associated mitigation measures for complete analysis of how the proposed project will affect and mediate important farmland in the Delta.</p>
558	2	Another negative impact is the depletion of essential freshwater from the Delta estuary and ground water supplies. My family and all of our neighbors rely on this groundwater supply and it seems that the state should protect it and not take it away.	<p>The EIR/S modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present. Changes in water quality, including salinity, under each action alternative and the proposed project as compared to the No Action Alternative and Existing Conditions are discussed in Chapter 8, Water Quality, in the EIR/S. The assessment of the project alternatives in Chapter 8, Water Quality, shows that the preferred alternative, 4A, would have substantially less effect on Delta water quality overall. Significant impacts were only identified for electrical conductivity (EC) at Emmaton and Prisoners Point, and for mercury associated with the limited tidal habitat restoration that would be implemented. The significant impacts to EC are to be mitigated through real-time operations that could not be completely represented in the modeling on which the EC assessment is based.</p> <p>The proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable changes relating to groundwater. As described in Impact GW-1 under Alternative 4A, dewatering during construction would temporarily lower groundwater levels by less than 10 feet in the vicinity of the intakes and by less than 20 feet near the Clifton Court Forebay during the duration of dewatering and up to two months after dewatering stops. It should be noted that those impacts would be the worst case scenario as implementation of seepage walls were not considered in the analysis. Mitigation Measure GW-1 identifies a monitoring procedure and options for maintaining an adequate water supply for land owners that experience a reduction in groundwater production from wells within 2,600 feet of construction-related dewatering activities. During operations, impacts would be less than significant.</p>
558	3	I am also very discouraged that the great State of California which prides itself as being on the very edge of technology and environmental protection would opt to keep using the antiquated method of shipping water from the north to the south without taking into consideration that there is no excess water in the north. Northern California would be made the "sacrificial lamb" destroying our water supply and farming for the benefit of the south. Surely our State has the brain power to come up with more innovative solutions. These solutions should include desalination, recycling, storage and increased efficiencies ensuring sustainable water supplies for a healthy Delta ecosystem and farmland protection.	<p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. Although conservation components and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including storm water drainage. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. Please also see Master Response 7 regarding desalination. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
558	4	The public should also be supplied with a cost-benefit analysis of any State water proposals. This state deserves and needs better and more innovative alternatives to the current plans and we sincerely hope that you will take the leadership to make this happen.	<p>The proposed project is costly, but proponents have assessed the benefits as described in the BDCP funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those facilities. Expenditures of public money from other sources would be limited to restoration activities beyond those needed to mitigate the impacts of facility construction. BDCP Chapter 8, which deals with cost issues, and cost-benefit analysis information are available on the BDCP website. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on project costs and funding.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>The proposed project is a joint RDEIR/SDEIS prepared in compliance with the requirements of CEQA and NEPA which do not include a cost-benefit analysis. An updated cost-benefit analysis will be prepared outside of the CEQA/NEPA process. Before the selection and approval of an alternative considered, the Lead Agencies must comply with the necessary state and federal environmental review requirements. The Final EIR/EIS is intended to provide sufficient CEQA and NEPA support for approval of the proposed project or any of the action alternatives for either compliance strategy. As implementation of the proposed project or any of the action alternatives will require permits and approvals from public agencies other than the Lead Agencies, the CEQA and NEPA documents are prepared to support the various public agency permit approvals and other discretionary decisions. These other public agencies are referred to as responsible agencies and 20 trustee agencies under CEQA (State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15381 and 15386) and cooperating agencies under NEPA (e.g., USACE and EPA). For more information please see 1.1.5 of Section 1 Introduction of the RDERI/SDEIS.</p> <p>Refer to Master Response 4 for information on alternatives considered.</p>
559	1	<p>I would like to register my objection to this project.</p> <p>http://swrcb2.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/deltaflow/docs/exhibits/swrcb/swrcb_ccwd2010.pdf</p> <p>http://www.watereducation.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/ccwd_historicalsalityhighlights_lr.pdf</p> <p>I reference the above reports as the basis for my objection. The "tunnel" project is not the right approach for our current water situation. Just moving water around does not help, nor does making more dams help either. The answer is to pursue alternative water resources such as desalination and reclamation.</p>	<p>As described in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, EIR/EIS, comments and suggestions received from the State Water Board were influential in defining the range and content of alternatives considered in the EIR/EIS, including the State Water Board's Delta Flow Criteria Report, prepared pursuant to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Reform Act of 2009. Scoping comments from the State Water Board included requests for an alternative providing for reduced diversions and an alternative incorporating changes to Delta outflows (and potentially inflows) that would reflect a more natural hydrograph. The Lead Agencies determined that an additional alternative would be required to be responsive to the State Water Board's comments. Informed by these comments, as well as several letters from the State Water Board to the Natural Resources Agency, DWR met with State Water Board staff to identify a general approach to model an increased spring Delta outflow alternative. This alternative was designed to increase spring Delta outflow by approximately 1.5 million acre-feet, on average, above the NEPA baseline assumptions. This became Alternative 8 as analyzed in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.</p>
559	2	Please do not pursue this project, as I have witnessed the decline in the delta first hand.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
560	1	No peripheral canal No two tunnels and Yes to Desalination for L.A. IN L.A.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>See Master Response36 (Peripheral Canal) and Master Response 7 (Desalination).</p>
560	2	ATT: 1 DWR Statement Regarding Delta Independent Science Board Comments on RDEIR/SDEIS	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
561	1	This is to inform you of my disapproval and formal protest to construction of the "Twin Tunnels" project to divert water under the San Francisco Bay/Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
561	2	<p>I have been following this project for some time and have attended public events including the so-called public hearing which you sponsored in Sacramento.</p> <p>I oppose this project for this reason:</p> <p>The projected current cost is now at \$17 BILLION with cost overrun estimates going as</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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>high as \$60 BILLION.</p> <p>Despite the high costs, not one additional drop of water is added to our current supply through production or storage.</p>	<p>Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal and State regulating agencies, ESA compliance, and project design. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The construction of the water delivery facilities is estimated to cost \$14.9 billion, an amount that would be paid for by the state and federal water contractors who rely on Delta exports. The range of costs for water vary widely among contractors south of the Delta. Costs depend on the source of water, transport facilities, energy requirements, among other factors. For the agricultural customers of the CVP, prices range from \$100 per acre-foot to more than \$400 per acre-foot. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, which buys water from the SWP, estimates that the cost of the proposed project would translate into about \$5.00 extra per household, per month in its service area. The final cost of water from the new conveyance facilities would be determined by numerous factors. A number of these significant factors, such as the project yield and allocation of costs, have yet to be determined. Please see Master Response 5 for information regarding funding of the proposed project.</p>
561	3	<p>I have been following this project for some time and have attended public events including the so-called public hearing which you sponsored in Sacramento.</p> <p>I oppose this project for this reason:</p> <p>The damage to the environment, animal and fish species that construction of these tunnels will produce is reprehensible and willingly misrepresented in the EIS/EIR report. 48,000 pages of misrepresentation, really?</p>	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>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 and mitigation measures will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible.</p> <p>Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
561	4	<p>I have been following this project for some time and have attended public events including the so-called public hearing which you sponsored in Sacramento.</p> <p>I oppose this project for this reason:</p> <p>The cost of the water delivered to Metropolitan Water District and the West Valley is the highest cost per acre foot when compared to other methods of water usage including the following: recycling, various conservation methods, construction of additional storage facilities state-wide, desalinization. This is derived from your own EIS report.</p>	<p>The commenter does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
561	5	<p>I have been following this project for some time and have attended public events including the so-called public hearing which you sponsored in Sacramento.</p> <p>I oppose this project for this reason:</p> <p>Projects of this magnitude should be put to the voters of the State of California.</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
561	6	<p>To be blunt, this project runs contrary to Governor Brown's plans to be known as a conservator and pioneer in the conservation and preservation of our environment.</p> <p>As a licensed engineer in the State of California, I have learned in my career that just because you can build something, does not mean you should. This state has demonstrated a poor track record of late in the construction and completion of major infra-structure projects, the east span of the San Francisco Bay Bridge coming to mind.</p> <p>This project is too costly for the State of California and is ill-conceived.</p>	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
562	1	I just read about 50 different points why the tunnels plan, and the overtaking of Delta water for south [and] central California, should not be. Besides, quit wasting our money.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
563	1	<p>After reading the analysis of the experts in this report, it is apparent to me that the tunnel project is not what we need.</p> <p>I agree that the Governor "needs to drop the tunnels project once and for all, and use his office to create a Marshall Plan for water sustainability for all Californians, not just mega growers in Westlands and the Kern County Water District, and certainly not for the Metropolitan Water District."</p>	<p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
564	1	My family strongly opposes implementation of the California WaterFix plan (formerly Bay Delta Conservation plan) as long as it continues to include the go-ahead for building twin tunnels in the Delta. In drought years these tunnels would be useless. In normal rainfall years (will we ever experience those again?) it would cause devastating harm to the Sacramento Delta ecosystem, taking huge acreage of fertile farmland out of production in the Delta area. Plus the water diversion would deplete vitally needed groundwater supplies. Without an infusion of freshwater from rivers into the Delta it will become a saltwater marsh, inhibiting water quality for millions of people living in the area. Farmers, fish, birds and untold wildlife would be heavily impacted from the degradation of this California water lifeline.	The issues raised by the commenter address the merits of the project and do not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS.
564	2	The billions of dollars estimated for construction of these twin tunnels is an unbelievable waste of money. Instead, re-direct the California WaterFix plan toward more useful suggestions, such as levee improvements, more/better water storage facilities, and desalination plants. We need to take what little water we have and make it work double for us -- such as through recycling water and the cleaning/filtration of grey water.	Please see Master Responses 37 and 7 regarding why alternatives focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, and desalination were not included in the EIR/EIS. While flood management is not a project purpose of the California WaterFix, it recognized that levee maintenance and safety in the Delta is an important issue for the residents of the Delta and for statewide interests. For more information regarding cost and funding sources please see Master Response 5.
564	3	The time has come to recognize that abundant water supplies are a thing of the past for California. We no longer should be farming in marginalized, poor soil areas which do not have nearby reliable water sources. We no longer should be farming in near-desert areas. We should continue to be farming in fertile Delta soils. It's a tough, rough outcome, but one that needs to be done for the betterment of California as a whole.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The SWP and CVP operations under the action alternatives would only deliver water under existing water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board to DWR and Reclamation for use by the SWP and CVP. The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Please do not go forward with the WaterFix plan as long as it contains instructions to build tunnels diverting freshwater in the Delta to lands in central/southern California.	increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.
565	1	<p>The tunnels project is a disaster that further imperils the largest estuary in all of North and South America.</p> <p>The project is nothing more than an environmentally destructive water grab by the central and southern parts of the state that have not adequately created or managed their own water resources.</p> <p>Devastation of the environment, landscape, native and migratory species is not a reasonable trade-off for any purported benefit.</p> <p>The desolation of the Owens Valley as effected by the Los Angeles Water Department's diversion of the Owens river, is an obvious example of what could be expected by the proposed "management" of the Delta water being exported from its natural path.</p> <p>The project is not and should never be considered a reasonable or responsible solution.</p>	Under the stringent environmental statutes in place today, including the Endangered Species Act, operation of the proposed water delivery system could not drain the Delta rivers and channels dry, including the Sacramento River. The proposed project's facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants, would be operated in accordance with permits issued by, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the State Water Resources Control Board, among other agencies. The proposed project would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards.
566	1	I have attached my comments on your Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California Water Fix. I could sum up my comments in one sentence: "Do you think that everyone in California is stupid?"	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
566	2	You make the statement that a tunnel capacity of 9,000 cfs [cubic feet per second] somehow enhances storage. The twin tunnels cannot enhance storage in any way.	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.
566	3	The state-of-the-art screens you describe are not new. Very little research has been done on fish screens in recent years. If you have an improved design for fish screening, why has it not been installed on existing diversions and as modifications to the screens used on the State Water Project pumping plant at Clifton Court?	A number of fish screens have received similar types of screens, e.g., at the site of the former Red Bluff Diversion Dam and the Freeport Regional Water Authority Intake. As with the proposed North Delta Diversion, these sites have riverine flow passing them, which allows the technology to work best; this is one of the limitations for using this technology at the State Water Project (e.g., on the channels leading to Clifton Court Forebay), where flows often are reversing.
566	4	You make the statement that 196 parcels of land will be impacted. Why then are you considering obtaining 300 parcels by [Eminent] Domain?	This comment is on potential eminent domain process for acquiring private property not on the content or process of the EIR/EIS. Reference to impacts on 196 parcels or acquisition of 300 parcels in the EIR/EIS could not be found. This comment is on the property acquisition plan.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
566	5	You state that salmon passage through the Delta will be enhanced by reducing cross flow providing a more suitable flow direction for fish passage through the Delta. However, use of the twin tunnels will decrease flow through the Delta. I agree that the tunnel will tend to reduce the cross flow. However, the amount of flow left to go through the Delta will be reduced. The problem with fish conditions in the Delta now is due to the lack of sufficient flow. The concept of the twin tunnels does nothing positive for anyone except for downstream diverters, those receiving water through Clifton Court Forebay.	Potential effects on covered fishes from changes in flow within the Delta are analyzed in the EIR/EIS; see Chapter 11.
566	6	You state that reverse flows created by diversions from the Delta are a problem for the Delta environment. That is true. However, operation of the twin tunnels will, in fact, increase the reverse flow problem, since even less flow will be available to oppose upstream tidal flows.	<p>The existing facility, export, and channel flow regulatory requirements for CVP/SWP water operations in the Delta, and additional operational scenarios for the inflow/export ratio, seasonal Delta outflow (i.e., spring and fall X2 flows), and conveyance bypass flows, are considered in the Final EIR/EIS (refer to Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives, Section 3.6.4) to meet project objectives and minimize adverse reverse flow conditions.</p> <p>The OMR flow criteria proposed as part of the proposed project chiefly serve to constrain the magnitude of reverse flows in the Old and Middle Rivers to limit fish entrainment into the south Delta and increase the likelihood that Delta smelt can successfully reproduce in the San Joaquin river. The criteria are derived from fish protection triggers described in the 2008 USFWS and 2009 NMFS BiOps RPA Actions, and are described in Table 3-7 and Table 3-34. These newly proposed additional OMR criteria (and associated head of Old River barrier operations) are designed primarily to secure operations that are expected to provide beneficial changes in south Delta flows under the proposed project, (i.e., they would lessen reverse flows in Old and Middle Rivers); and they are only applicable after the proposed north Delta diversion becomes operational.</p>
566	7	You state that the twin tunnels will increase water security. However, they will increase water security only for those users receiving water diverted through Clifton Court Forebay.	<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. Please refer to Master Response 5.</p> <p>The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management). The proposed project would not increase the amount of water to which SWP and CVP hold water rights for use allowed under their contracts and permits and approvals for refuge water supplies or other environmental purposes.</p>
566	8	Construction and operation of the twin tunnels will do nothing to improve the environmental health of the Delta. The current environmental problems in the Delta are caused by insufficient flows through the Delta. Diversion through the twin tunnels will reduce flows through the Delta and worsen the situation. Thus, the twin tunnels can only worsen the situation.	By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria 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 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.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
566	9	I do not see how the changed design of the twin tunnels can reduce the power demands of operating the system. Whether the pumping plant is at the upper end or lower end of the tunnel, does not affect the amount of energy required to move 9,000 cfs [cubic feet per second] through the tunnels	Section 21.3.1 Method for Analysis in the DEIR/DEIS and FEIR/FEIS describes how the energy needed to pump water through a tunnel or pipeline depends on the velocity of the water; a larger tunnel will reduce the velocity and thereby reduce the energy required. The intake pumping to the intermediate Forebay was also eliminated in Alternative 4A.
566	10	The twin tunnels will certainly be vulnerable to earthquake damage. Repairing any such damage would be extremely difficult and costly.	Impact GEO-7 in Chapter 9 describes the potential effect of ground shaking on the tunnels and described how the tunnels would be designed and constructed to withstand the effects of shaking. The commenter is correct in asserting that repairing a damaged tunnel would be difficult and costly. Consequently, as described in GEO-7, the tunnels would be designed and constructed such that they are not damaged by the design earthquake ground motions.
566	11	The tunnel system, in itself, can do nothing to protect fish in the Delta. If anything, its operation will worsen environmental conditions for the fish.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and 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. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
566	12	Virtually no design features or construction considerations are provided in the report. In fact, [fewer] details of design and construction are provided in this revision than were provided in the initial report. Construction of the tunnels will be quite difficult because of high groundwater levels and the type of earth materials encountered. As conceived, the tunnel with air shafts, located at roughly equal distances along the tunnel, will more than likely cause surging within the tunnel, which will result in overtopping of the airshafts, and local flooding around them. This condition was observed in the USBR [Bureau of Reclamation]-constructed conduit distributing flow within the Coachella Valley Irrigation system in 1954 and in the USBR-constructed Canadian River Project in Texas in 1967.	<p>The 2013 Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS include primarily programmatic analyses as specific engineering details of the project cannot yet be known. Please see Master Response 2 for further discussion regarding the project-level versus program-level analysis.</p> <p>The 2013 Draft EIR/EIS and 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS include primarily programmatic analyses as specific engineering details of the project cannot yet be known. Please see Master Response 2 for further discussion regarding the project-level versus program-level analysis.</p> <p>Project plans have not advanced yet to the point where engineering and design work are complete. Environmental review is typically conducted based on less complete plans, because complete engineering and design work is not required for impact assessment, and most project proponents are reluctant to invest in complete engineering and design work before they know that their projects have received the entitlements and permits needed to proceed towards construction. Please see Master Response 2 for further information regarding the level of detail provided in the EIR/EIS Analysis.</p>
566	13	You imply that construction and operation of the tunnels will alleviate the effects of sea level rise. Diverting flow through the twin tunnels will increase the effects of sea level rise by reducing flow going through the Delta to oppose tidal inflow. Thus, the twin tunnel operation will increase salinity content further upstream than exists at the present time.	The potential for water conveyance operations to affect salinity conditions in the Delta (including Suisun Marsh) under existing conditions and future no action conditions, and with implementation of each project alternative (including conservation measures), is assessed in detail in Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the EIR/EIS for the salinity-related parameters bromide (Impact WQ-5), chloride (Impact WQ-7), and electrical conductivity (Impact WQ-11). Where significant impacts to water quality would occur due to the alternative, mitigation to lessen those impacts is provided.
567	1	My family and friends live in the Delta region because we frequently use the Delta for recreation: we water ski, swim, wakeboard, etc. We regularly enjoy being both in and on the Delta water. The exposure to increased contaminants is a serious concern because we are in physical contact with the Delta water every weekend.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised. The potential for water conveyance operations to affect contaminants in the Delta (including Suisun Marsh) under existing conditions and future no action conditions, and with implementation of each project</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			alternative (including conservation measures), is assessed in detail in the EIR/EIS. The assessments consider the potential for project alternatives to result in water quality changes that may adversely affect recreational beneficial uses. Where significant impacts to uses would occur due to the alternative, mitigation to lessen those impacts is provided.
567	1	The purpose of this letter is to state my strong opposition to the Delta tunnels plan. The California Water Fix doesn't fix anything and it doesn't meet restoration goals defined in the Delta Reform Act of 2009 in which the California State Legislature committed to the Co-Equal Goals of providing a more reliable water supply for California, protecting and restoring the cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of the Delta. If the Delta tunnels are built these co-equal goals cannot be upheld.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <p>For more information regarding the proposed project's compliance with the Delta Reform Act please see Master Response 31.</p>
567	2	The Delta tunnel plan will only export more water out of the already frail San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary/eco-system. The Delta tunnels do nothing to improve or increase our water storage capacity and it won't provide a more reliable water supply. The Delta water is already overburdened & over-subscribed by 5 times in what was previously "normal" water years...but what is the "new-normal" with climate-change? The tunnels would be dry if they existed now.	<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>The SWP and CVP operations under the action alternatives would only deliver water under existing water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board to DWR and Reclamation for use by the SWP and CVP with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. 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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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.</p> <p>The project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities, including operations to protect water quality, can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html).</p> <p>As shown in Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Model Results, of the EIR/EIS, the north Delta intake tunnels would not be fully utilized except for periods of time when the Sacramento River flows are higher than in drought years. 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.</p> <p>Future reservoir projects are still undergoing evaluation or review, including potential reservoir projects. Therefore, potential reservoir projects are only considered in the EIR/S as cumulative impact projects (please see Master Response 37). The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change with continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p>
567	3	There are many wildlife and plant species in the Delta whose lives are dependent on freshwater including the Delta smelt, Chinook salmon, steelhead, the San Joaquin kit fox, and tricolored blackbird. These Delta inhabitants are protected species already struggling and on the brink, they are facing decimation due to a diminishing food-web and the Delta-tunnels will seal their fate.	Chapter 11 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect fish. Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect plant and wildlife species. Both chapters describe the impacts, both negative and positive, and discuss measures that would be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts and to compensate for significant impacts.
567	4	I believe the Delta water Plan does not comply with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act which prohibits federal agency actions that are likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered species or that "result in the destruction or	The commenter states that the project does not comply with the Endangered Species Act. Critical habitat for several species does occur within the Plan Area. Some project activities will take place within areas of designated critical habitat and in some cases cause impacts there; however, whether or not adverse

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		adverse modification of [critical] habitat of [listed] species." These protected species will eventually cease to exist...meaning extinction...because of a woefully flawed Delta tunnel plan.	<p>modification of that critical habitat will occur will be determined by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and NOAA Fisheries during Section 7 Consultation and not in the EIR/EIS. The USFWS has defined destruction or adverse modification as follows: "Destruction or adverse modification means a direct or indirect alteration that appreciably diminishes the conservation value of critical habitat for listed species. Such alterations may include, but are not limited to, effects that preclude or significantly delay the development of the physical or biological features that support the life-history needs of the species for recovery." 79 FR 27060 (May 12, 2014)</p> <p>Although destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat of species would be a significant impact under CEQA, it would not violate the Endangered Species Act. Critical habitat designation is a tool that gives the USFWS and NOAA Fisheries authority to regulate the adverse modification of critical habitat for listed species, when the action requires federal funding or approval. Both Chapter 11 and 12 of the Final EIR/EIS address impacts on critical habitat and discuss measures that would be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts and to compensate for significant impacts.</p>
567	5	The Delta tunnels plan will cause increased contamination of municipal water supplies and the wells for the millions of rural & urban residents living in the five Delta counties which includes me & my family.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised. The potential for proposed project alternatives to affect water quality constituents of concern for municipal water supply uses in the project area is assessed in detail in the EIR/EIS. Where significant impacts to uses would occur due to the alternative, mitigation to lessen those impacts is provided.
567	6	The Delta tunnels plan fails to model for potential increases of carcinogens and other formation of byproducts that would cause cancer and other serious health effects.	<p>Appendix 22C, Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix Health Risk Assessment for Construction Emissions, evaluates the human health risks resulting from construction emissions produced by each of the 18 water conveyance alternatives proposed. The health risk assessment considers three types of health hazards: (1) acute non-carcinogenic hazards; (2) chronic non-carcinogenic hazards; and (3) carcinogenic risk.</p> <p>Chapter 25, Public Health, addresses the potential effects on human health of implementing the action alternatives. Specifically, the potential effects addressed in Chapter 25 are (1) exceedance(s) of water quality criteria for constituents of concern; (2) increase in the public's risk of exposure to vector-borne diseases; (3) mobilization or increase in constituents known to bioaccumulate; (4) exposing people to electromagnetic fields; (5) exposure of recreationists to pathogens in recreational waters; (6) increase Microcystis in surface waters such that municipal and domestic supply and water contact recreation beneficial uses are negatively affected. Please refer to Master Response 14 regarding Microcystis.</p>
567	7	Environmental justice communities, those who depend on subsistence fishing, will face Food and Health Insecurities as a result of increased contaminants, specifically mercury contamination, in fish and wildlife populations.	The assessment of the project alternatives in Chapter 8, Water Quality, shows that the preferred alternative 4A would have substantially less effect on Delta water quality such that significant impacts were only identified for electrical conductivity (EC) at Emmaton and Prisoners Point, and mercury associated with the limited tidal habitat restoration that would be implemented. Environmental Commitment 12 would be implemented to minimize the formation of methyl mercury and associated impacts in fish and wildlife populations.
567	8	My family & friends live in the delta region because we frequently use the delta for recreation, we water ski, swim, wakeboard, etc.. We regularly enjoy being both "in" and "on" the delta water. The exposure to increased contaminants are a serious concern because we are in physical contact with the delta water every weekend.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised. The potential for water conveyance operations to affect contaminants in the Delta (including Suisun Marsh) under existing conditions and future no action conditions, and with implementation of each project alternative (including conservation measures), is assessed in detail in the EIR/EIS. The assessments consider the potential for project alternatives to result in water quality changes that may adversely affect recreational beneficial uses. Where significant impacts to uses would occur due to the alternative, mitigation to lessen those impacts is provided.
567	9	California's largest cities Los Angeles, San Diego, and San Jose all rely on water exports. In order to fund the proposed "Water-Fix" water rates and/or property taxes in these municipalities will increase...but they will get no additional water...how does this "fix"	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		anything for these cities?	<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. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p>
567	10	The San Francisco Bay currently has less than 20% of the natural water flows it had before we started diverting water to the south. The State needs to analyze how the lack of fresh water and diverted water flows will impact San Francisco Bay tourism and recreation. These industries which are worth billions annually depend on fresh water flows from the Delta for crab and salmon fisheries, wildlife sightings, boating, and their restaurant economies.	<p>As described in Chapter 6, Surface Water, Section 6.3, in San Francisco Bay, Central Coast, South Coast, Tulare Lake, South Lahontan, and Colorado River hydrologic basins, SWP/CVP water supplies are conveyed in pipelines and canals and do not directly affect surface waters. Construction of facilities under the alternatives all would occur in the Delta of the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River basins. Therefore, the environmental consequences are focused on changes in surface water resources in the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River basins and the Delta only. Impacts are not expected in the San Francisco Bay.</p> <p>As described in Chapter 6, Surface Water, Section 6.3, in San Francisco Bay, Central Coast, South Coast, Tulare Lake, South Lahontan, and Colorado River hydrologic basins, SWP/CVP water supplies are conveyed in pipelines and canals and do not directly affect surface waters. Construction of facilities under the alternatives all would occur in the Delta of the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River basins. Therefore, the environmental consequences are focused on changes in surface water resources in the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River basins and the Delta only. Impacts are not expected in the San Francisco Bay.</p> <p>As described in Impact ECON-5 under Alternative 4A in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, construction of water conveyance structures would be anticipated to result in a lower-quality recreational experience in a number of localized areas throughout the Delta, despite the implementation of environmental commitments. With a decrease in recreational quality, particularly for boating and fishing (two of the most popular activities in the Delta), the number of visits would be anticipated to decline, at least in areas close to construction activities. Under this alternative, recreational uses in the Delta at Clifton Court Forebay and in small areas of the Cosumnes River Preserve on Staten Island would be directly affected by construction activities. Six other recreational sites or areas would experience periods of construction-related effects, including noise, access, visual disturbances, or a combination of these effects. As described under Impact REC-2 in Chapter 15, Recreation, these include Clarksburg Boat Launch (fishing access), Stone Lakes NWR, Wimpy's Marina, Delta Meadows River Park, Bullfrog Landing Marina, and Lazy M Marina. Overall, the multi-year schedule and geographic scale of construction activities and the anticipated decline in recreational spending would be considered an adverse effect. The commitments and mitigation measures cited above would contribute to the reduction of this effect.</p> <p>An assessment of water quality effects resulting from changing Delta water quality and outflows on San Francisco Bay water quality is provided in Impact WQ-34 in Chapter 8, Water Quality, for all alternatives. The water quality assessment considered potential changes in constituent levels for all constituents of concern assessed in detail in Impacts WQ-1 through WQ-30, including changes in salinity, mercury, nutrients, and selenium. The assessment concluded that Alternative 4A would have a less than significant impact to San Francisco Bay water quality.</p>
567	11	The Delta Agricultural economy consists of generations of family farms and farm workers and generates \$5.2 billion annually for the California economy. Salt-water intrusion is already impacting the western Delta farms. The Delta tunnels will remove Sacramento River freshwater from the system exacerbating the salinity intrusion problem. Delta farmers cannot irrigate crops with salt water nor can they plant crops in soils contaminated by salt.	The potential for water conveyance operations to affect salinity conditions in the Delta (including Suisun Marsh) under existing conditions and future no action conditions, and with implementation of each project alternative (including conservation measures), is assessed in detail in Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the EIR/EIS for the salinity-related parameters bromide (Impact WQ-5), chloride (Impact WQ-7), and electrical conductivity (Impact WQ-11). Where significant impacts to water quality would occur due to the alternative, mitigation to lessen those impacts is provided.
567	12	California's coastal fishing industry & its communities depend on thriving wildlife. This industry is worth billions annually, with the salmon industry worth \$1.5 billion annually	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
		alone. This industry provides thousands of jobs, the livelihoods of these Californian industries & communities are reliant on the sustainability of our shared resources. This industry & those who live & work in those communities will be negatively impacted by the Delta-tunnel water-grab.	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.
567	13	Another concern I have is the operation and construction of the delta tunnels will obstruct and disable navigable waterways for boating, marinas and other types of leisure activities. The delta tunnels will create conditions of low water flow that will foster invasive water species, such as water hyacinth.	Impacts TRANS-12 through TRANS-19 discuss impacts on navigation from changes in surface water elevations caused by construction and operations of water conveyance facilities. Because it does not involve a physical change in the environment, effects to navigation, by themselves, are not considered environmental impacts under CEQA. Any secondary physical environmental impacts that may result are covered under other impacts. Nonetheless, as explained above, changes in surface water elevation during construction of the intakes will not have a significant impact on navigation. The project proponents have also made a commitment to contribute to funding the California State Parks Division of Boating and Waterways' Programs for Aquatic Weed Control, which will provide for the control of egeria, water hyacinth and other invasive aquatic vegetation throughout the Plan Area.
567	14	Low water flow conditions will cause poor water quality which is unsafe for recreation. Recreation and tourism in the Delta generate \$750 million annually.	As stated in Chapter 15, Recreation, Section 15.3.3, CALSIM modeling results indicate that effects to the Sacramento and San Joaquin river flows are less than significant. Additionally, the project would result in a reduction of reverse flow conditions in the Old and Middle rivers, creating a positive change, in the majority of months on a long-term average basis compared to Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative. Therefore, they are not discussed further in Chapter 15. 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. Environmental commitments to prevent water quality effects include environmental training; implementation of stormwater pollution prevention plans, erosion and sediment control plans, hazardous materials management plans, and spill prevention, containment, and countermeasure plans; disposal of spoils, RTM, and dredged material; and a barge operations plan (Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs).
567	15	Alternatives to the Delta Tunnels which are less expensive and less environmentally destructive were largely ignored, the tunnel plan was rail-road down our throats without serious consideration of alternatives other than new, upstream conveyance. The decision in favor of increasing water exports from the Delta was made long before the public comment period began and the entire approval process has been tilted in its favor.	Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria 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, Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, and Master Response 37 regarding water storage.
567	16	California's "Water Fix" should focus on the following: More aggressive water efficiency program statewide that would apply to both urban	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
		and agricultural users.	<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>For information regarding the beneficial use of water, please see Master Response 34.</p>
567	17	<p>California's "Water Fix" should focus on the following:</p> <p>Funding water recycling and groundwater recharging projects statewide that would be billions of dollars less expensive for rate payers than constructing a new version of the Peripheral Canal or major new surface storage dams. Meanwhile, these projects move communities towards water sustainability.</p>	<p>The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of a particular water supply augmentation approach (more recycling, groundwater storage) and 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.</p>
567	18	<p>California's "Water Fix" should focus on the following:</p> <p>Retiring thousands of acres of impaired and pollution generating farmlands in the southern San Joaquin Valley and using those lands for more sustainable and profitable uses, such as solar energy generation.</p>	<p>The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of a particular water supply augmentation approach (agricultural land retirement) 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 and Master Response 3 for information on the purpose and need for the proposed project.</p>
567	19	<p>California's "Water Fix" should focus on the following:</p> <p>Improving Delta levees in order to address potential earthquake, flooding, and future sea level rise concerns at a cost between \$2 to \$4 billion and is orders of-magnitude less expensive than major conveyance projects that are currently being contemplated.</p>	<p>The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>Please refer to Appendix 6A for discussion about levee improvements and flood management in the Delta, which are not components of this proposed project.</p> <p>The commenter does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS.</p>
567	20	<p>California's "Water Fix" should focus on the following:</p> <p>Increasing freshwater flows through the Delta to reduce pollutants so ecosystems and wildlife can be restored.</p>	<p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
567	21	<p>California's "Water Fix" should focus on the following:</p> <p>Installing fish screens at the south Delta pumps to reduce the current salvage of marine life.</p>	<p>The Proposed Project would enable DWR to construct and operate new conveyance facilities that improve conditions for endangered and threatened aquatic species in the Delta while at the same time improving water supply reliability, consistent with California law (see, e.g., Cal.Wat. Code, § 85001[c]). Implementing the conveyance facilities would help resolve many of the concerns with the current south Delta conveyance system, and would help reduce threats to endangered and threatened species in the Delta, including entrainment at the south Delta export facilities. For instance, implementing a dual conveyance system would align water operations, and their location, to better reflect natural seasonal flow patterns by creating new water diversions in the north Delta equipped with State-of-the-art fish screens, thus reducing reliance on south Delta exports during times of the year when listed aquatic species are present and most vulnerable. For more information on mitigation measures to minimize contraction and operational-related impacts to fish species, including Delta and longfin smelt, please see Chapter 11, RDEIR/SDEIS.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
567	22	The Delta has problems that need to be addressed, but the CA Water Fix tunnels are old-school thinking that won't fix them. The tunnels won't produce more water, more reliable supplies, or improved conditions for the environment in the Delta. The solution to California's water issues must go well beyond prioritizing water conveyance to the south, the "Water-Fix Program" does not achieve this. The EIR/EIS does not adequately address my concerns that is why I oppose the Delta Tunnels/California Water Fix (Alternative 4A).	The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.
567	23	I propose that Reclamation & DWR prepare and circulate a new Draft EIR/EIS which includes alternative plans for consideration by the public and decision-makers, plans & goals for reducing water exports and increase delta flows. These types of alternatives plans are more likely to comply with the Delta Reform Act, the Clean Water Act, and the Federal Endangered Species Act.	<p>The Lead Agencies respectfully disagree with the general assertion that the documentation is fundamentally flawed as stated by the commenter. The documentation generated by this proposed project has undergone extensive public and scientific input, discussion, and transparency, including the posting of administrative draft chapters online and providing many more opportunities for public participation than is normally required by the CEQA/NEPA processes (see Master Response 41 [Transparency]. Please also refer to Master Response 29 (Section 7), which addresses how the agencies are proceeding with ESA compliance, in addition to CEQA/NEPA review, and the various documents prepared pursuant to the respective statutory schemes will be completed and made available consistent with the applicable legal requirements. Additionally, Master Response 45 (Permitting) addresses USACE permitting.</p> <p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. The premise of the California WaterFix is that it will provide environmental benefits while stabilizing water supplies for a large population of California residents, consistent with statutory policy as found in the Delta Reform Act of 2009 (see, e.g., California Public Resources Code, §§ 85001(c), 85002, 85004(a), 85020.) Refer to Master Response 31 (Compliance with the Delta Reform Act).</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/S were also considered and described, See Appendix 3A of the EIR/EIS and Section 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 (Alternatives) for additional information regarding the development and evaluation of project alternatives.</p>
568	1	<p>A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF FOOTHILL MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT IN SUPPORT OF CALIFORNIA WATERFIX AND CALIFORNIA ECORESTORE</p> <p>WHEREAS, in April 2015, the Brown and Obama administrations proposed a revised path to protecting water supplies that are imported from Northern California while restoring the declining ecosystem of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta;</p> <p>WHEREAS, the new state-federal proposal identifies a new, preferred alternative within the Delta environmental review process that advances water system improvements as a stand-alone project while phasing in habitat restoration in a separate, but coordinated fashion;</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.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>WHEREAS, California WaterFix will provide a 9,000 cubic feet per second facility that will complement local water supply projects by allowing the safe capture of water in wet and above-normal years so that it can be stored and used in dry years;</p> <p>WHEREAS, California EcoRestore will accelerate and implement a comprehensive suite of habitat restoration actions to support the long-term health of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta's native fish and wildlife species;</p> <p>NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF</p> <p>FOOTHILL MUNICIPAL WATER DISTRICT as follows:</p> <p>Section 1. The Board of Directors support California WaterFix and California EcoRestore programs; and,</p> <p>Section 2. A copy of this resolution shall be sent to our state legislative representatives and key members of the Administration.</p> <p>PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED on September 28, 2015.</p>	
569	1	<p>Is there any one of you in charge, where the money flows, to hear the people's cry?</p> <p>Save our Delta! The people don't want this, but our voice is ignored!</p>	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
569	2	<p>Let southern California find their own solution. They have it all, the big money, movie industry, entertainment center, beautiful beaches, great weather, high-class restaurants. Don't let them steal our water.</p> <p>It's my understanding that there is big money invested in the crops, which take millions of gallons of water, by big money [corporations]. It's not the small farmer benefitting. Big money again!</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p>
569	3	<p>What about our generations to come?</p> <p>Again, we are crying loud [and] clear: Save the Delta! Let's put it to a vote!</p>	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
569	4	[ATT1: Stockton Record article dated 2015-09-23 titled "Four Delta islands could be sold to Southern California water district."]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
569	5	[ATT2: Lodi News-Sentinel article dated 2015-09-23 titled "Delta tunnels will only benefit big business, oil."]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
569	6	[ATT3: Associated Press article dated 2015-09-23 titled "L.A. water district eyes huge recycling plan."]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
569	7	The answer for LA. [See ATT3] They have all the beautiful ocean there. All we have here is our beautiful Delta! Save it.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
570	1	My position on this plan is that it will not do anything to solve the water problem. Therefore, I am against the building of any tunnels that will transport water from the Sacramento River to Central Valley.	<p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
570	2	The Delta farmlands are some of the most fertile in the world. We should ensure that these farmlands are not destroyed. Doing so would have a negative effect on all the towns along the Sacramento [River] from Courtland to San Francisco.	<p>The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. The proposed project does not propose any changes to existing agricultural practices.</p> <p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via California WaterFix proposed conveyance facilities.</p>
570	3	In addition to destroying the agriculture business in the Delta, you would be destroying the fishing industry.	<p>While fishing would be reduced at select locations during construction, it would not be reduced in the Delta as a whole. Please refer to Impact REC-4 under Alternative 4A in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, the project would result in a less-than-significant impact on recreational fishing opportunities. Please also refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass.</p> <p>As described in Impact ECON-5 for Alternative 4A in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, construction of water conveyance structures would be anticipated to result in a lower-quality recreational experience in a number of localized areas throughout the Delta, despite the implementation of environmental commitments. Under this alternative, recreational uses at Clifton Court Forebay and in small areas of the Cosumnes River Preserve on Staten Island would be directly affected by construction activities. Six other recreational sites or areas would experience periods of construction-related effects, including noise, access, visual disturbances, or a combination of these effects. As described under Impact REC-2 in Chapter 15, Recreation, these include Clarksburg Boat Launch (fishing access), Stone Lakes NWR, Wimpy's Marina, Delta Meadows River Park, Bullfrog Landing Marina, and Lazy M Marina. Overall, the multi-year schedule and geographic scale of construction activities and the anticipated decline in recreational spending would be considered an adverse effect. The commitments and mitigation measures cited above would contribute to the reduction of this effect. Access would be maintained to all existing recreational facilities, including marinas, throughout construction. As part of Mitigation Measure REC-2, project proponents would enhance nearby fishing access sites and would incorporate public recreational access into design of the intakes along the Sacramento River. Implementation of this measure along with separate other commitments as set forth in Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs, relating to the enhancement of recreational access and control of aquatic weeds in the Delta would reduce these effects. Environmental commitments would also be implemented to reduce some of the effects of construction activities on the recreational experience. Similarly, mitigation measures proposed throughout other sections of this document, and listed under Impact REC-2 in Chapter 15, Recreation, would also contribute to reducing construction effects on recreational experiences in the study area.</p>
570	4	Special interest groups are promoting this plan as they stand to profit from it. We must	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		make sure that the people's voices are heard. There are signs along Hwy 5 stating that Congress created this desert. No! God made the Central Valley a desert. It was a desert when the first Europeans arrived and it will still be a desert 300 years from now. You cannot fight nature; you must work alongside nature.	
571	1	Mercury in the water: falsely blamed on the levees. The mercury comes from the mines and a major clean-up project should be started at the origin.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
571	2	The tunnels/pipes are a major disaster. The Delta farms provide food to local people and bring in billions of dollars in revenue.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
571	3	The communities of the Delta rely on the water from the Sacramento River as their water source. This should not be jeopardized.	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.
571	4	Farming in the desert should be limited to annual crops which can go fallow in times of drought. All farming should be irrigated with drip irrigation. Seeing water spraying in the Central Valley is disheartening and very wasteful.	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.
571	5	If California is to survive global warming and increasing droughts, we need to create more water -- not just move it from place to place. Cleaning and replenishing aquifers, recycling and reusing water, water conservation, [and] increased storage -- covered whenever possible. We need smart new thinking to save endangered species and to ensure that Californians don't join that rank.	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. 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).
572	1	I strongly oppose building tunnels to divert water and bypass the Delta. This project is outrageously expensive, damages the environment, damages the Delta economy, impairs recreational opportunities, and disproportionately harms less-advantaged people in order to provide a more reliable water supply to already wealthy agricultural interests. Some urban users will receive a dubious promise of more reliable supplies. I believe what we city-dwellers can count on is stringent rationing and paying exorbitant rates in the future to pay for this boondoggle. These tunnels are a bad deal from every angle: money, construction, operation, land use, fish and wildlife, working people, water quality, and above all, the non-beneficial use of most of the water, leading to urban rationing and pollution of ground and	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. More than two-thirds of the residents of the state and more than two million acres of highly productive farm land receive water exported from the Delta watershed. The proposed project aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. However, the project proponents have no authority to designate what water is used for. One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>surface water by agricultural and industrial processes.</p> <p>We already generously subsidize water deliveries for agriculture. It's time to reduce, not increase the subsidies. We need a well thought-out, comprehensive, fair, sustainable water policy in California, not the inequitable hodgepodge that exists today and was created by special interests for profit and power rather than for the public good. This tunnel scheme is the opposite of what we need and so similar to past water grabs that I don't understand how any self-respecting, honest public servant could go along with it.</p>	<p>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>
573	1	<p>I strongly oppose building tunnels to divert water and bypass the Delta. This project is outrageously expensive, damages the environment, damages the Delta economy, impairs recreational opportunities, and disproportionately harms less-advantaged people in order to provide a more reliable water supply to already wealthy agricultural interests. Some urban users will receive a dubious promise of more reliable supplies. I believe what we city-dwellers can count on is stringent rationing and paying exorbitant rates in the future to pay for this boondoggle.</p> <p>These tunnels are a bad deal from every angle: money, construction, operation, land use, fish and wildlife, working people, water quality, and above all, the non-beneficial use of most of the water, leading to urban rationing and pollution of ground and surface water by agricultural and industrial processes.</p> <p>We already generously subsidize water deliveries for agriculture. It's time to reduce, not increase the subsidies. We need a well thought-out, comprehensive, fair, sustainable water policy in California, not the inequitable hodgepodge that exists today and was created by special interests for profit and power rather than for the public good. This tunnel scheme is the opposite of what we need and so similar to past water grabs that I don't understand how any self-respecting, honest public servant could go along with it.</p>	<p>Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>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>
573	4	<p>[ATT 1:]</p> <p>Description: Phase I Grant Status; Improved Water Purification (New Technology Clyde A. Livingston, exclusive owner of intellectual property Provisional Patent for improved water purification) feasibility of technology has demonstrated by Forum Tuesday August 25, 2015 and the demand for freshwater, development of this prototype and the requested proposed assistance from Dr. Robert Kostecki, LLBL. Assistance to develop an invention prototype has been requested by me for the purpose of product development, procurement and marketing under the supervision of Dr. Robert Kostecki.</p> <p>We are pleased in presenting Proposal and Solution to California Drought Solutions Forum, hosted by Congressman Jerry McNerney August 25, 2015. A major problem facing all Californians is freshwater shortage (drought).</p> <p>On this day of the California Drought Solutions Forum I informed Congress of this new technology and it was soon at hand to render relief to the California freshwater</p>	<p>Please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. Please refer to Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives. 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 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS and Master Response 6 for more information regarding demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>shortage. Dr. Kostecki was in attendance and was briefed on my invention also.</p> <p>At the Forum it was clearly stated that there is current funding available for development of new technology related to water in association [with] California water agencies. My invention could give California a fresh start with purified water via [an] ionization process.</p> <p>The possibility for this type of purification surpasses the current and developing technologies. The best current technology and [latest] upgrades can do is oxidize or scrub toxic material mixed into water (electrolysis and chemical filtration and separation process yield very small amounts, if any, [of] freshwater reclaimed). Pesticides and petroleum products cannot be completely removed from [a] water source once contaminated.</p> <p>However, with the development of my new technology the problems of water purification in the past will be relieved by introduction of my invention. The Provisional Patent is that of professional standards, top of the line for prototype development of descriptions, diagrams and figures of invention.</p> <p>The current California BDCP has farmers very concerned about the loss of water in short supply. Therefore, proposed tunneling routes to send new water south is not feasible with reserves in northern California in short supply and southern [California's] watershed full. There are currently no plans or feasible solutions for sending water back to northern California. In theory, ionizing water [with a] new water purification invention has demonstrated unlimited potential as alternative freshwater source with development it can relieve California's freshwater consumption problems in conjunction with California and National Environmental Water Quality Act by improving habitat for endangered species. In accordance with agency missions, the EPA, in compliance [with the] Endangered Species Act, would open avenues for enhancement of environmental quality, improving on local and nation levels for water quality and fisheries.</p>	
574	1	How will construction of the tunnels over a fourteen-year period help with drought?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
574	2	Will the state conduct a full cost-benefit analysis of the project that includes the value of freshwater to the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary?	DWR is revising the Socioeconomic Impact Analysis for the project based on changes included in the RDEIR/SDEIS. An updated cost-benefit analysis will be prepared outside of the CEQA/NEPA process.
574	3	How much water is available for export through the tunnels in a drought after prior water rights and public trust needs are met? And if there isn't any, how often will the tunnels be dry?	The SWP and CVP operations under the action alternatives would only deliver water under existing water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board to DWR and Reclamation for use by the SWP and CVP with consideration for senior water rights, Area of Origin laws and requirements, and public trust flow requirements as established by federal and State agencies. The project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities, including operations to protect water quality, can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html). The total exports through the north Delta and south Delta intakes for all alternatives are presented in Chapter 5, Water Supply, and Appendix 5A, Section C, Model Results, in the EIR/S</p> <p>As shown in Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Model Results, of the EIR/S, the north Delta intake tunnels would not be fully utilized except for periods of time when the Sacramento River flows are higher than in drought years. 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.</p>
574	4	How does California Water Fix help reduce reliance on Delta imports as mandated by the 2009 Delta Reform Act?	<p>Under the range of alternatives considered in the EIR/S full contract amounts are not delivered in the majority of times to the SWP and CVP water contractors, as presented in Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Model Results, of the EIR/EIS. Long-term water deliveries to SWP and CVP water contractors located south of the Delta are lower under Alternatives 6, 7, and 8 as compared to the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative. The EIR/S and the Draft BDCP were prepared in a manner to comply with the 2009 Delta Reform Act, as described in Appendix 3I, BDCP Compliance with the 2009 Delta Reform Act, of the Final EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).</p>
574	5	The State Water Resources Control Board, the Department of Water Resources, and the Bureau of Reclamation have allowed for the waiving and weakening of Delta water quality standards for all water uses and species protections during the drought, endangering numerous Delta species and bringing some to the precipice of extinction. How can San Francisco Bay-Delta business, tourism, fishing, and farming communities trust the tunnels would be operated any better?	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
574	6	Isn't the majority of the habitat designated under California Eco Restore for mitigation for the 2008 biological opinions? Isn't that habitat for damage already done to the Delta?	The commenter is asking a question about California EcoRestore and its relationship to the 2008 Biological Opinions. EcoRestore does include implementation of the required mitigation for the State Water Project and Central Valley Project. California EcoRestore is unassociated with any of the proposed habitat restoration under Alternatives 2D, 4A, and 5A in the EIR/EIS but does include much of the BDCP conservation strategy presented in the HCP/NCCP alternatives.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
574	7	How does a Delta tunnels-only project and less than 2000 acres of mitigation habitat comply with the 2009 Delta Reform Act "coequal goals" of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration while protecting the Delta as a place?	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion I the north Delta and new operating criteria 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 would also include habitat restoration to reduce effects on the water conveyance facility on listed species and has reduced many of the Delta footprint impacts, compared to other alternatives addressed in the EIR/EIS by constructing tunnels versus canals, rerouting the alignment to affect less private property and reduce effects on Staten Island to reduce effects on greater sandhill crane. In addition, the State is also implementing the California Delta EcoRestore program to restore up to 30,000 acres of Delta habitat.
574	8	If the North Delta diversions are better for fish, how much will the over overall "take" or "kill" numbers for endangered fish species be reduced? What can we expect in terms of reduction numbers?	The take authorization, if issued, will be included in the BiOp from NMFS and FWS and in the Incidental Take Permit from DFW.
574	9	Where does the water for the tunnels come from? What will that do to the source area? How long is it sustainable? Have you analyzed the economic and environmental impacts on those regions?	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. Senior water rights holders are not affected by implementation of action alternatives. The CALSIM II model assumptions provide the same deliveries to senior water rights holders under the No Action Alternative and all action alternatives. As discussed in Chapter 5, Water Supply, of the EIR/S, climate change, sea level rise, and population growth in the northern Delta watershed are anticipated to effect senior water rights holders (as shown in the comparison between the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative model runs) with or without implementation of the action alternatives. The EIR/EIS considers environmental impacts to source waters, e.g., in Chapter 11, upstream effects of reservoir operations are considered on a variety of fishes. Chapter 12 discusses the issue of upstream effects in Section 12.3 on page 12-134 of the Final EIR/EIS.
574	10	According to Dr. Jeff Michael of University of the Pacific, the estimated benefits for the project drop by \$10 billion without regulatory assurance for water deliveries. How can farmers afford such costly water and hope to maintain a profit? How much of the project will urban ratepayers and property tax payers Southern California and Silicon Valley pay for the project?	<p>Please see Master Response 5 regarding costs of implementation and funding for the BDCP. As described in Impact ECON-6 under Alternative 4A in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, construction of conveyance facilities would convert land from existing agricultural uses to project-related construction uses, and agricultural land could also be affected by changes in water quality and other conditions that would affect crop productivity. These direct effects on agricultural land are described under Impacts AG-1 and AG-2 in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources. Total value of irrigated crop production in the Delta would decline on average by \$5.3 million per year during the construction period, with total irrigated crop acreage declining by about 4,700 acres. Other effects related to production costs, travel time, and loss of investments in production facilities and standing orchards and vineyards would also occur as a result of facilities construction. When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the alternative. While the compensation to property owners would reduce the severity of economic effects related to the loss of agricultural land, it would not constitute mitigation for any related physical impact.</p> <p>Under Alternative 4A, publicly-owned water conveyance facilities would be constructed on land of which some is currently held by private owners. Property tax and assessment revenue generated by lands that would be transferred from private to is estimated to total \$6.7 million over the construction period. Typically, decreases in revenue could potentially result in the loss of a substantial share of some agencies' tax bases and particularly for smaller districts affected by a project. However, California Water Code (Section 85089 subdivision 9b) specifies that the entities constructing and operating a new Delta conveyance facility will fully mitigate for the loss of property tax revenues or assessments levied by local governments or special districts. This Water Code requirement will ensure that tax revenues forgone as a result of transferring land from private to public ownership will be fully offset.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
575	1	How will construction of the tunnels over a fourteen-year period help with drought?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
575	2	Will the state conduct a full cost-benefit analysis of the project that includes the value of freshwater to the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary?	DWR is revising the Socioeconomic Impact Analysis for the project based on changes included in the RDEIR/SDEIS. An updated cost-benefit analysis will be prepared outside of the CEQA/NEPA process.
575	3	How much water is available for export through the tunnels in a drought after prior water rights and public trust needs are met? And if there isn't any, how often will the tunnels be dry?	<p>The SWP and CVP operations under the action alternatives would only deliver water under existing water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board to DWR and Reclamation for use by the SWP and CVP with consideration for senior water rights, Area of Origin laws and requirements, and public trust flow requirements as established by federal and State agencies. The project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities, including operations to protect water quality, can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html). The total exports through the north Delta and south Delta intakes for all alternatives are presented in Chapter 5, Water Supply, and Appendix 5A, Section C, Model Results, in the EIR/S</p> <p>As shown in Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Model Results, of the EIR/S, the north Delta intake tunnels would not be fully utilized except for periods of time when the Sacramento River flows are higher than in drought years. 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.</p>
575	4	How does California Water Fix help reduce reliance on Delta imports as mandated by the 2009 Delta Reform Act?	<p>Under the range of alternatives considered in the EIR/S full contract amounts are not delivered in the majority of times to the SWP and CVP water contractors, as presented in Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Model Results, of the EIR/EIS. Long-term water deliveries to SWP and CVP water contractors located south of the Delta are lower under Alternatives 6, 7, and 8 as compared to the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative. The EIR/S and the Draft BDCP were prepared in a manner to comply with the 2009 Delta Reform Act, as described in Appendix 3I, BDCP Compliance with the 2009 Delta Reform Act, of the Final EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).</p>
575	5	The State Water Resources Control Board, the Department of Water Resources, and the Bureau of Reclamation have allowed for the waiving and weakening of Delta water	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		quality standards for all water uses and species protections during the drought, endangering numerous Delta species and bringing some to the precipice of extinction. How can San Francisco Bay-Delta business, tourism, fishing, and farming communities trust the tunnels would be operated any better?	
575	6	Isn't the majority of the habitat designated under California Eco Restore for mitigation for the 2008 biological opinions? Isn't that habitat for damage already done to the Delta?	The commenter is asking a question about California EcoRestore and its relationship to the 2008 Biological Opinions. EcoRestore does include implementation of the required mitigation for the State Water Project and Central Valley Project. California EcoRestore is unassociated with any of the proposed habitat restoration under Alternatives 2D, 4A, and 5A in the EIR/EIS but does include much of the BDCP conservation strategy presented in the HCP/NCCP alternatives.
575	7	How does a Delta tunnels-only project and less than 2000 acres of mitigation habitat comply with the 2009 Delta Reform Act "coequal goals" of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration while protecting the Delta as a place?	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion I the north Delta and new operating criteria 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 would also include habitat restoration to reduce effects on the water conveyance facility on listed species and has reduced many of the Delta footprint impacts, compared to other alternatives addressed in the EIR/EIS by constructing tunnels versus canals, rerouting the alignment to affect less private property and reduce effects on Staten Island to reduce effects on greater sandhill crane. In addition, the State is also implementing the California Delta EcoRestore program to restore up to 30,000 acres of Delta habitat.
575	8	If the North Delta diversions are better for fish, how much will the over overall "take" or "kill" numbers for endangered fish species be reduced? What can we expect in terms of reduction numbers?	The take authorization, if issued, will be included in the BiOp from NMFS and FWS and in the Incidental Take Permit from DFW.
575	9	Where does the water for the tunnels come from? What will that do to the source area? How long is it sustainable? Have you analyzed the economic and environmental impacts on those regions?	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. Senior water rights holders are not affected by implementation of action alternatives. The CALSIM II model assumptions provide the same deliveries to senior water rights holders under the No Action Alternative and all action alternatives. As discussed in Chapter 5, Water Supply, of the EIR/S, climate change, sea level rise, and population growth in the northern Delta watershed are anticipated to effect senior water rights holders (as shown in the comparison between the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative model runs) with or without implementation of the action alternatives. The EIR/EIS considers environmental impacts to source waters, e.g., in Chapter 11, upstream effects of reservoir operations are considered on a variety of fishes. Chapter 12 discusses the issue of upstream effects in Section 12.3 on page 12-134 of the Final EIR/EIS.
575	10	According to Dr. Jeff Michael of University of the Pacific, the estimated benefits for the project drop by \$10 billion without regulatory assurance for water deliveries. How can farmers afford such costly water and hope to maintain a profit? How much of the project will urban ratepayers and property tax payers Southern California and Silicon Valley pay for the project?	Please see Master Response 5 regarding costs of implementation and funding for the BDCP. As described in Impact ECON-6 under Alternative 4A in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, construction of conveyance facilities would convert land from existing agricultural uses to project-related construction uses, and agricultural land could also be affected by changes in water quality and other conditions that would affect crop productivity. These direct effects on agricultural land are described under Impacts AG-1 and AG-2 in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources. Total value of irrigated crop production in the Delta would decline on average by \$5.3 million per year during the construction period, with total irrigated crop acreage declining by about 4,700 acres. Other effects related to production costs, travel time, and loss of investments in production facilities and standing orchards and vineyards would also occur as a result of facilities construction. When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the alternative. While the compensation to property owners would reduce the severity of economic effects related to the loss of agricultural land, it would not constitute mitigation for any related physical

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>impact.</p> <p>Under Alternative 4A, publicly-owned water conveyance facilities would be constructed on land of which some is currently held by private owners. Property tax and assessment revenue generated by lands that would be transferred from private to is estimated to total \$6.7 million over the construction period. Typically, decreases in revenue could potentially result in the loss of a substantial share of some agencies' tax bases and particularly for smaller districts affected by a project. However, California Water Code (Section 85089 subdivision 9b) specifies that the entities constructing and operating a new Delta conveyance facility will fully mitigate for the loss of property tax revenues or assessments levied by local governments or special districts. This Water Code requirement will ensure that tax revenues forgone as a result of transferring land from private to public ownership will be fully offset.</p>
576	1	<p>Our organization [Delta Caucus] is still reviewing the Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report/Supplement Draft Environmental Impact Statement that was released for public review and comment. We have not finished reviewing the document and request the comment period be extended for 60 days. Take into consideration this is a busy time for all California farmers who are harvesting and the time period does not grant sufficient time to review the document thoroughly.</p> <p>We are requesting a 60-day comment period extension to allow adequate time to review the proposed changes and make comments. Changes in the Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report/Supplement Draft Environmental Impact Statement would make a significant impact on California agriculture and warrants a longer period for review and comments.</p>	<p>The comment period for the RDEIR/SDEIS was extended by 60 days. Please see Master Response 39 for more information about the public review period. For more information regarding impacts to agriculture and its associated mitigation measures please see Chapter 14 of the FEIR/EIS.</p> <p>Significant Impacts or adverse environmental effects to important farmland and Williamson Act or Farmland Security Zones are extensively discussed in Chapter 14 of the EIR/EIS and Section 4 of the RDEIR/RDEIS. The impacts and effects of the recently added alternatives fall within the broad scope of the earlier discussions of alternatives in the DEIR/DEIS.</p> <p>Please also see Master Response 18 regarding agricultural impact mitigation. The commenter expresses concern about the project's potential effects on the Delta but does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS.</p>
577	1	Are detours proposed? If so, they should be included in the map book.	Detours during project construction activities that affect roadway travel are proposed and required as part of Mitigation Measure TRANS-1A. Roadway detours will be developed and mapped during creation of detailed traffic management plans as discussed in Mitigation Measure TRANS-1A.
578	1	<p>In the 1980s at the planning stage of South Valley Water Project, I was studying at the University of California, graduating from the College of Natural Resources. During my studies I wrote several papers on Southern Valley Water Project, a shift in water suppliers to Los Angeles Basin. I proposed the Central Valley Project could only be [a] short-term solution; as an efficient long-term supply it would depend on alternative watersheds and supplies (Hetch Hetchy and EBMUD [East Bay Municipal Utilities District]) to complement and back up the Central Valley Water Project (supply), additional water storage collection for dry years, proposed as only optimal long-term water supply without causing dissertation in supply region overtime. [sic]</p> <p>Approval of the Project without proposed conservation measures, thereby ignoring the micro hydrologic cycle of the region [and] implementing an inefficient allocation of current project application, has changed the basis of the optimal solution or sustainable water supply from Central Valley Water Project.</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Water delivered to the SWP and CVP water contractors participating in proposed project would be within the existing contract amounts to serve agricultural lands that have been cultivated and existing and planned community populations, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply. The proposed project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply.</p> <p>The proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). Future reservoir projects are still undergoing evaluation or review, including potential surface water reservoir projects and groundwater storage projects. Therefore, potential storage projects are only considered in the EIR/S as cumulative impact projects (please see Master Response 37). Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			resources.
578	2	<p>The constant removal of water from central California overtime evaporation transportation creates "evaporation transformations." Transforming the LA Basin into mountain lakes and a major flood basin and leaving the Central Valley in a permanent drought scenario, southern California unprepared for this change in hydrology, all addition rainwater was lost to ocean runoff. [sic]</p> <p>Southern California has built up water reserves and will continue to receive large amounts of rain during the winter due to evaporation transformation. The current measures implemented by [the] region of central California must be modified before we run out of fresh water. If conditions continue from SWP/BDCP this will have the opposite effect as expected under the Endangered Species Act; instead, permanent loss of freshwater will wipe out the endangered species we are protecting.</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase flows in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries in drier periods.</p> <p>The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well. The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/.</p> <p>The EIR/S modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.</p> <p>Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p>
578	3	I propose, "the new tunneling technology used for BDCP be also used to create additional watershed for central California."	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
579	1	No twin tunnels	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
580	1	Save the delta	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
581	1	<p>Again, the tunnels are coming up again.... like a bad penny,.....I agree with the [Delta County Coalition] DCC, the Tunnels are not a good idea. We need storage and conservation not moving water around to meet the needs of special interest groups.</p> <p>"We all agree California needs a comprehensive plan to address the state's ever-growing water needs; however, the 'California Water Fix' really doesn't fix anything as it relates to many other pressing California water issues, such as the need to capture, conserve and preserve our limited water supplies now and into the future," said Sacramento County Supervisor Don Nottoli.</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/S were also considered and described, See Appendix 3A of the EIR/EIS and Section 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS.</p> <p>This process included numerous public workshops and scoping meetings, extensive input from agencies, stakeholders, and the public, and an extensive multi-level screening process to refine the alternatives to be carried forward for full analysis in the EIR/EIS. As explained in Final EIR/EIS Appendix 3A "Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives", the alternative development process for the EIR/EIS was based upon a</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>"The latest tunnel plan not only moves away from the mandated co-equal goals of a stable water supply and enhanced environmental protection, but it still fails to provide one additional drop of water to our parched system," said San Joaquin County Supervisor Kathy Miller.</p> <p>"We remain concerned about the potential impacts of the tunnels on local communities in the Delta, including Clarksburg," said Yolo County Supervisor Oscar Villegas. "A six-week comment period for a project of this magnitude, with significant local traffic, noise, water quality, and other impacts, does not allow affected agencies or residents enough time to review and provide meaningful comments."</p> <p>"We agree there is an urgent need to address the problems with California's water supply and to restore the Bay-Delta ecosystem and are supportive of the comprehensive approach developed by the State in the January 2014 California Water Action Plan. However, this flawed California WaterFix proposal that solely looks at a Delta plumbing fix does nothing to improve the Delta ecosystem or provide a more reliable water supply" said Contra Costa County Supervisor Mary Nejedly Piepho. "The DCC calls on the State to refocus on setting flow requirements and export restrictions necessary to restore and sustain the Bay-Delta ecosystem and to support actions to produce additional local water supplies for the state (wastewater reuse projects, desalination, additional storage), rather than further sacrificing the already fragile Delta."</p> <p>"The changes to the revised-BDCP do not make for a stronger, healthier Delta or reflect critical Delta stakeholder input," said Solano County Supervisor John Vasquez. "A six-week comment period for a project of this magnitude, with divestment of a major habitat conservation component and other modifications, does not allow enough time for affected agencies such as the Delta Counties, to review and provide meaningful comment."</p>	<p>number of legal considerations including: (1) the legal requirements for adequate discussions of alternatives in an EIR and EIS, as set forth in CEQA and NEPA respectively, and the regulations and case law interpreting those statutory schemes; (2) the concepts of "potential feasibility" under CEQA and "reasonableness" under NEPA; and (3) the requirements of Water Code Section 85320 from the 2009 Delta Reform Act. The results of a multi-level screening process reflecting these considerations were further compared to the requirements of the Delta Reform Act and scoping comments related to the definition of potential EIR/EIS alternatives as identified by responsible and cooperating agencies under CEQA and NEPA, respectively.</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. Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives and the Tunnel Option), Master Response 31 (Delta Reform Act), Master Response 37 (Storage), and Master Response 41 (Transparency).</p>
581	2	<p>The [Delta County Coalition] DCC has collaborated over the past seven years to advocate for protecting the interests of the Delta and California's water supply and continue to seek opportunities to work with the State to address these critical issues. To achieve a Delta that has economic and environmental balance, the DCC has repeatedly pursued a Delta plan that genuinely meets the criteria of the 2009 Delta Reform Act.</p> <p>Such actions include:</p> <p>1) Improving the ability to move water around as needed with water system improvements.</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The EIR/EIS was prepared in a manner to comply with the 2009 Delta Reform Act, including sections that are included in this comment, as described in Appendix 3I, BDCP Compliance with the 2009 Delta Reform Act, of the EIR/EIS.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>2) Increasing storage capacity.</p> <p>3) Reinforcing our levee system.</p> <p>4) Protecting and improving water quality and quantity.</p> <p>5) Local storage, increased conservation plans, water reuse and recycling and desalination.</p> <p>6) Restoring the Delta's health.</p>	
582	1	<p>The proposed water grab with two huge tunnels to divert water south to the California aqueduct is a bad idea. It will wreak havoc on the Delta by allowing more salt water to intrude into the Delta, destroying habitat, potentially poisoning the aquifer with salt water and the result will be farm land that will be lost forever so that the farmers and developers in Southern California can benefit and turn desert land into profits. This does not seem equitable or just.</p> <p>You can see the effects of this damage to farming and ecosystems by studying the Nile River. For centuries, Nile river water was diverted for human activity allowing more and more salt water to infiltrate the Nile delta water shed from the Mediterranean Sea. Today the threat of rising sea levels and infiltration of salt water is a real concern. San Francisco Bay will continue to rise and the tunnels will exasperate [sic] the situation.</p> <p>http://deltas.usgs.gov/presentations/Ghobrial,%20Mary.pdf</p>	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the adequacy of the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The potential for water conveyance operations to affect salinity conditions in the Delta (including Suisun Marsh) under existing conditions and future no action conditions, and with implementation of each project alternative (including conservation measures), is assessed in detail in the EIR/EIS. Where significant impacts to uses would occur due to the alternative, mitigation to lessen those impacts is provided.</p>
582	2	<p>In addition to this huge potential ecological disaster, it appears that the rights of farmers, landowners and recreational users of the Delta are being trampled on by powerful special interests in Southern California including the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power and Westside water district. To understand Southern California's history of destroying land and water resources look no further than the Owens Valley and the San Joaquin River in the early part of the last century. Don't turn our Delta into another Owens Valley.</p> <p>This isn't just about fish. It's about the rights of people who use and manage this great resource.</p> <p>Speak out and vote no on the tunnel project.</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights 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. Senior water rights holders are not affected by implementation of action alternatives. 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 adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S.</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>
583	1	<p>Destroying the already decimated salmon population with the delta tunnel project is totally unacceptable! in the Sacramento River and Bay-Delta estuary.</p> <p>Reject this immediately. The governor is becoming an expert in the destruction of the environment and is a non-caring leader who is ruining too many aspects of what this</p>	<p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		state is and should be.	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.
584	1	In the midst of an historic drought, California simply can't afford to build dams for corporate agribusiness or to purchase water transfers for these interests, many of which are growing and exporting water-intensive crops to China ... like Stewart Resnick's Paramount Farms, which is one of the largest and most politically influential growers that has consistently demanded more water at the expense of the public and the environment.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
584	2	The Delta tunnels won't solve our drought problems and fail to address the root causes of California's water crisis. California needs to invest billions of dollars in fixing our cities' crumbling and leaking water and sewer systems, expanding water recycling and cleaning up groundwater, and prioritizing water for disadvantaged communities. Moreover, taxpayers should not be forced to pay for dams that won't create any new water for most Californians.	The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of a particular water supply augmentation approach (more recycling, groundwater treatment) and 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.
585	1	The California WaterFix, Alternative 4A will prioritize the use of scarce water by unsustainable agricultural operations that export much of their products. Both of these are unacceptable.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. 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. In addition to permitting constraints on daily operations of the SWP and CVP, DWR and Reclamation must maintain proper performance and bypass flows across fish screens when endangered and threatened fish species are present within the north Delta facilities area.</p> <p>The range of alternatives in the EIR/EIS includes alternatives which result in reductions in SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta as compared to the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative and Alternatives 4H1, 4H2, 4H3, 4H4; 5; 6A, 6B, 6C; 7; 8; and 9 would result in less SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta than under Existing Conditions (shown in Tables 5-5 and 5-8). Similarly, Alternatives 6A, 6B, 6C; 7; 8; and 9 would result in less SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta than under the No Action Alternative (shown in Tables 5-6 and 5-9). However, SWP and CVP water deliveries would continue under all alternatives.</p> <p>The 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,</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.
585	2	The California WaterFix, Alternative 4A does not begin to address our need to find ways to share the planet and its resource with other creatures or even other, less powerful, human communities.	<p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
586	1	This Delta Tunnels plan is a horrible idea. It will do nothing to solve CA's water shortage long term and will decimate the already imperiled salmon population. Wow, this is a huge boondoggle that the taxpayers will be forced to pay for. It's a total giveaway to the big agricultural industry so they can continue to waste water on crops that should not be grown there in the first place. The answer is to start managing the water you have more efficiently by recycling, more efficient sprinkler systems and groundwater recharge. I really hope the people in CA aren't forced to pay for this horrendous tunnel that will create more problems than it solves. And what will your solution be when you've sucked the Delta dry?	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue 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>Although components such as desalination plants and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. It is important to note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 34 for additional details on the determination of beneficial use and Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.</p>
587	1	<p>This "fix" sure looks more like "cheating" the system that is supposed to look out for all concerned. It is wrong to keep taking, taking and taking until there is nothing left. That is what is going on here.</p> <p>There will always be excess demand. The trick is to evolve by meeting the challenge head on. These tunnels subvert that process so that we rob Peter to pay Paul. That will only make things worse down the road.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Refer to Master Response 45 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 44 (Changes in Delta Exports) and Master Response 5 (Demand Management).</p>
588	1	This project would divert freshwater from areas that are protected as critical habitat for endangered fish...including salmon!	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal and State regulating agencies, ESA compliance, and project design. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p>
589	1	I believe it was Edward Abbey who said "Unlimited growth is the philosophy of a cancer cell." Southern California's growth has depended for too long on taking water from other parts of the state (and country) to artificially sustain its unsustainable growth.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
590	1	Taxpayers will bear the brunt of the estimated \$60 billion project, all for the benefit of the deep-pocketed corporate agriculture.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project would cost approximately \$15 billion to build. There would be additional costs for mitigation of approximately \$800 million. The water would be used by the State and Federal water projects that supply drinking water for 25% of Californians, and for agricultural production throughout northern, central, and southern California. Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on the costs of project implementation.</p>
591	1	I've heard of very few ecologically stupider proposals than this. Even the peripheral canal would have been better!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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.</p>
592	1	As a science teacher who knows that salmon will not survive this project, I vote for saving and protecting the salmon over this unsound fiasco!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project would enable DWR to construct and operate new conveyance facilities that improve conditions for endangered and threatened aquatic species in the Delta while at the same time improving water supply reliability, consistent with California law (see, e.g., Cal. Wat. Code, § 85001[c]). Implementing the conveyance facilities would help resolve many of the concerns with the current south Delta conveyance system, and would help reduce threats to endangered and threatened species in the Delta, including entrainment at the south Delta export facilities. For instance, implementing a dual conveyance system would align water operations, and their location, to better reflect natural seasonal flow patterns by creating new water diversions in the north Delta equipped with State-of-the-art fish screens, thus reducing reliance on south Delta exports during times of the year when listed aquatic species are present and most vulnerable.</p>
593	1	We do not know exactly what effect this type of project would have on the local ecosystem. We have seen time and time again the detrimental effects of our past environmental decisions. Can we really afford to make more short sighted and possibly detrimental decisions? I think not!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 17 (Biological Resources).</p>
594	1	Under this plan, the Delta's water would be used by big Ag to irrigate high-water nut crops in unsustainable desert land that are largely exported.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
595	1	<p>As a resident of the Trinity River watershed I strongly disagree with the excessive use of our waters by farmers in the Central Valley and I believe that this project will add incentives to take additional waters from fish, wildlife, and local people in our watershed.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>
596	1	<p>Much of our northern California water is already going to southern California. We are all on water rationing in the north, but friends who recently stayed in southern California found hotels and motels were not using low water fixtures and it was life as usual in their wasteful use of our good water.</p> <p>This is not a "water fix" at all. It is "politics as usual" using cute terms to hide what is happening. Votes may be in the south, but it is wrong to send our water to them. I recently drove from Paso Robles to Bakersfield and was appalled at the huge expanse of wineries and more. Also on Hwy 101 south, it is winery after winery in areas that were open before to livestock only. Yes, it is northern California water! We need it too.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 43 (Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 45 (Purpose and Need), and Master Response 5 (Demand Management).</p>
596	2	<p>You cannot "restore the Delta" by removing its water. Who thought that one up?</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. 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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S. In addition to permitting constraints on daily operations of the SWP and CVP, DWR and Reclamation must maintain proper performance and bypass flows across fish screens when endangered and threatened fish species are present within the north Delta facilities area. The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project.</p> <p>The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).</p>
597	1	This is another outrage where the public interest and the environment lose to private greed. There are alternatives that do not cost taxpayers billions, destroy more habitat, and imperil species. I am appalled that California is considering this ridiculous, unscientific, and extremely shortsighted scheme. Shame on you, Governor Brown (from whom we expected more), and federal agencies who refuse to work with nature rather than continue outdated and, frankly, stupid methods for mitigating human affect upon our environment.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
598	1	Most of the water would go to Big Ag companies in the San Joaquin Valley to grow water-intensive almonds and pistachios on unsustainable desert soils for oversea exports. This is not something that needs to be happening in California. For all these reasons, I urge you to reject this harmful project.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need of the Project.</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, Demand Management Measures, for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p>
599	1	I live in Wisconsin, where at the moment, we have an adequate water supply. I have a number of good friends in California and I know the water situation there is dire. But	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		robbing from one area of the environment to prop up another will only result in both failing, unless of course the drought ends soon.	<p>Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria 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>