

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5000	1	I believe the tunnels will destroy the delta. And I believe there is some sort of special interest and money to be made if it is pushed through. It is not for the good of all people in the state, only a select few.	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.
5001	1	I was born and raised on the Delta and I cannot fathom the destruction that will occur to our beautiful river and its inhabitants.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5002	1	Tunnels are not the solution	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5003	1	We are in a drought and we need Delta's water to stay in Northern California!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5004	1	I'm signing this because the delta needs the water to save the fish which is a huge industry in California and to keep the salt water from ruining our farm lands.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5005	1	From one fishing community to another. These can impact a life of adventures. Water is life!	On-water recreation such as fishing and boating would still be accessible throughout the Delta during and after construction of the proposed project.
5006	1	I oppose this project. Cut off the water hogs in LA and shut off the golf courses...	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply), and Master Response 6 (Demand Management).
5007	1	Because I want to protect my environment	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5008	1	I believe that water is important to the very livelihood of everyone involved in the Central Valley. I don't feel like a water should be stolen from the citizens of this county and sold to the highest bidder. I also feel that the government needs to stay in its place in no severe representatives of the citizens of this county and of this state and they should do what they are directed to do by the citizens who put them in office. So with that being said I feel that the Delta tunnels should not be built will not be built and we should deal with those people who are in charge that want to have these built despite our protest they should be dealt with accordingly as well as removed from office he never voted for again I eat stop being career politicians and be regular citizens just like the rest of us.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5009	1	I want to stop the tunnels... Its our natural water... and I love the fish in it... save our delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5010	1	I am against the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria 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
5011	1	I am against the tunnels. You cannot grow flowers in the desert. You will kill the delta and San Francisco Bay.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5012	1	The removal of largemouth, smallmouth or striped bass has no positive effect on the initiative and a significantly negative effect on outdoorsman and the millions of much needed dollars they infuse into this budget challenged economy.	<p>Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.</p> <p>Please refer to Impacts ECON-7, 11, and 17 in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, regarding recreation-related socioeconomic impacts.</p>
5013	1	Because too many ecosystems have already been damaged.	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.
5014	1	I'm signing because I value the rich farmland and wildlife of the Delta. They are more important than the tunnels. Water can be shipped in other ways. The farmland and wildlife can't simply move elsewhere.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Chapter 12 (Terrestrial Resources) for impacts to terrestrial species and mitigation for these impacts and Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation).
5015	1	Save the delta	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5016	1	The tunnels make no sense.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5017	1	We need our water for many reasons!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5018	1	I want to save the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5019	1	I moved to the region for freshwater access for skiing and fishing. With climate changes means that the snow pack won't be consistent and the Delta region can no longer support the central and southern California water requirements.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
5019	2	I do believe in a sustainable solution....desalination. Yes, it's expensive, but will force the population to value and respect water usage. While southern California is green and lush, my lawn is dead and I'm tearing it out with a drought tolerant landscape.	Please see Master Response 7 for a discussion on desalination.
5020	1	I strongly apposition the tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5021	1	I love the delta and fishing and trying to save wildlife.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5022	1	The tunnels will be taking water from Sacramento River to San Joaquin River and mess the fish's natural honing system where by they template to the natal streams they	Water diverted from the Sacramento River would not be released into the San Joaquin River, but would be diverted to the north cell of the modified Clifton Court Forebay, before entering the SWP/CVP pumping plants. Analyses of changes in olfactory cues were presented in the EIR/EIS; see, for example, Impact

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		were born into. They know where to return to and where to spawn in as adults.	AQUA-41 for winter-run Chinook salmon in Chapter 4 of the RDEIR/SEIS.
5023	1	Our indigenous tribes share vast wisdom that does not agree with these tunnels. Our indigenous people have lost so much of the land, watershed and fisheries they sustained for thousands of years. Follow the plight and wisdom of the Winnemem Wintu tribe to learn about the decimation of what's left of their culture and sacred sites as a direct result of these tunnels and the Shasta Dam raise...	The commenter's opinion related to the DEIR/S is acknowledged. 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.
5024	1	Voted no on the peripheral canal and this is just another version of it.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 36 for information on how the proposed project differs from the peripheral canal.
5025	1	A unique area of California. I travel halfway around the world to visit the Delta and experience this great part of northern California.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5026	1	I am very concerned with the loss of natural habitat that would occur not only for aquatic life but for birds as well.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Chapter 12 (Terrestrial Resources) for impacts to terrestrial species and mitigation as well as Master Response 17 (Terrestrial Mitigation).
5027	1	Most politics are bullshit, especially the ones dealing with the Delta tunnels! You people must not fish or hunt, god help you!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5028	1	I oppose the current plan for the underground water export tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5029	1	Water needs to be managed more equitably and responsibly.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change with continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).</p>
5030	1	I am opposed to even gallon of our precious Delta water being sent south. We need to have water for our farms and recreation and wildlife. Spend the money and effort to	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		desalinate ocean water. Leave our Delta alone.	
5031	1	The tunnels won't create any more water, but they will cause terrible environmental destruction. I want a healthy Delta and healthy native species, including salmon and the tunnels will cause significant deterioration of the Delta including loss of salmon and other species and significant deterioration in water quality.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS.
5031	2	They are also unjust in that they will destroy the livelihood of Delta farmers by leaving them without water or taking their land through eminent domain. I want a sustainable water policy for California. I do not want a water grab by Big Ag and the tunnels are nothing but a water grab.	The proposed project would not leave farmers without water or take all farmland in the Delta. When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the alternative. Please refer to Master Response 26 regarding changes in Delta exports and Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
5032	1	Northern California's waters have been taken again and again to support unattainable growth in Southern California and Central California. Isn't it clear that we don't want a peripheral canal?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 36 (Peripheral Canal).
5033	1	To save the delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5034	1	I'm signing because the monetary cost, environmental cost, and opportunity cost of the tunnels are all too great.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Chapter 12 (Terrestrial Resources) for impacts to terrestrial species and mitigation. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding).
5035	1	Stop messing with Mother Nature!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5036	1	This will ruin the Delta towns and poison the farmland, kill the freshwater fish.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Chapter 12 (Terrestrial Resources) for impacts to terrestrial species and mitigation. Refer to Master Response 24 (Delta as A Place), Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation) and Chapter 11 of the EIR/EIS (Aquatic Resources).
5037	1	I live on the Delta and understand the irreparable damage these tunnels will do. Not willing to pay that price.	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.
5038	1	Governor Brown is an idiot and destroyer of the Great State of California.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5039	1	These tunnels will be a waste of California taxpayer money, and the drought won't be solved by throwing money at it.	Please refer to Master Response 5 regarding implementation of costs. For more information regarding funding sources please see Master Response 5. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5040	1	This is a disaster for the Delta, fish, wildlife and people living there too	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Chapter 12 (Terrestrial Resources) for impacts to terrestrial species and mitigation.
5041	1	The California Delta ecosystem has been steadily declining for years because of over pumping and salinity incursion. Taking fresh water from the upper Sacramento River will further decrease the flows of fresh water flushing out the south Delta and potentially increasing salinity.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
5042	1	The water already is nonexistent so why would try to take more?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5043	1	This project will ruin the environment in so many ways.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5044	1	Opposed to taking water from the Delta due to environmental issues.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5045	1	I fish the delta every year when I visit my brother in law. This would affect me also.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.
5046	1	Stop ruining our environment!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5047	1	I am concerned about the health of the Delta and oppose the tunnels as a waste of resources and a further degradation of this valuable watershed. There are sustainable alternatives which need to be implemented instead.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 4 for a discussion on alternatives associated with the proposed project.
5048	1	I oppose the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5049	1	I and all my neighbors would be affected!	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. For more information regarding impacts to socioeconomics and its associated mitigation measures please see Chapter 16 of the FEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5050	1	Governor Brown obviously has an investment in this and doesn't care about what damage it will do. More big business ruining our country. When will the madness stop?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5051	1	It's not their water to begin with	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5052	1	The Delta is where I was born and raised one of the most beautiful places to live and a very large supplier of food a very meaningful rich heritage for many wonderful people	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
5053	1	Removing water from the San Francisco Delta, whether by a peripheral canal which voters already rejected, or by underground tunnels, will adversely impact the fishing and farming industry of northern California, merely to benefit agribusiness in southern part of the state. State government should look to benefit the entire state.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. It is not the result of "favoring" large corporations (e.g., large agribusinesses). In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Change in Delta Exports), Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply), Master Response 36 (Peripheral Canal), and Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation).
5054	1	We don't need the tunnels	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5055	1	We need to restore the Delta not destroy it!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Although Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A include only those habitat restoration measures needed to provide mitigation for specific regulatory compliance purposes, habitat restoration is still recognized as a critical component of the state's long-term plans for the Delta. Such larger endeavors, however, will likely be implemented over time under actions separate and apart from these alternatives. The primary parallel habitat restoration program is called California EcoRestore (EcoRestore), which will be overseen by the California Resources Agency and implemented under the California Water Action Plan. Under EcoRestore, the state will pursue restoration of more than 30,000 acres of fish and wildlife habitat by 2020. These habitat restoration actions will be implemented faster and more reliably by separating them from the water conveyance facility implementation.
5056	1	Stop messing with Mother Nature!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5057	1	I live in the Delta and this would totally ruin the environment and our life.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5058	1	I want a safety and sane delta and California	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5059	1	I'm signing because I voted against this same idea back in 1982 and it's still a bad idea. This short-sighted plan won't create any new water supplies. It will just drain the water and will create an environmental disaster and destroy the Delta and San Francisco Bay.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environment impacts in the EIR/S were raised. Refer to Master Response 36 (Peripheral Canal).

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5060	1	The Delta cannot be sacrificed for selfish and for profit only reasons; it's nature at its best and offers so much. Don't do it!	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
5061	1	There has to be laws to stop the destruction to our California wetlands. The delta is the heart, sole and kidneys of the California water system and the tunnel project is doing major bypass surgery by a bunch of buffoons!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5062	1	This will destroy the Delta estuary.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5063	1	Save the Delta	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5064	1	For the amount of money spent and to be spent on the tunnels we could build and maintain desalination plants up and down the coast and relieve some of the drought concerns before we worry about how to ship nonexistent water to wealthy supporters in the South.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
5065	1	This is a totally unsustainable project that will negatively impact all the west coast watershed.	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.
5066	1	We need the water here in the Delta to help our farmers and ranchers survive	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.
5067	1	Our water ways are already not flowing well. We have invasive weed problems in the water ways. Fishing and boating would be greatly diminished due to lack of water flow.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>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.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Operations of Alternative 4 and the new preferred alternative, 4A, are not expected to result in a substantial decrease or increase in Delta surface water levels. Please refer to Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Modeling Results, EIR/EIS, for more information.</p> <p>As discussed under Impact REC-3 in Alternative 4A, impeding boat passage and navigation and resulting impacts on recreation would occur during construction of the intakes, temporary barge unloading facilities, and siphons. Although Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a would reduce impacts on navigation associated with barge unloading facilities, the impact of constructing the water conveyance facilities would be considered significant and unavoidable because of the duration of construction.</p>
5067	2	The Delta where I live would let more salt water intrude upriver farther than normal. Our land absorbs the salt. Things don't grow.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
5067	3	The tunnels would destroy our precious ecosystem. Tunnels would not help anyone but big business. Not anyone who lives near or on river. Lives would drastically change for millions of Californians! Please do more intense studies before any changes allowed to Delta.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. Other than in the direct vicinity of the three intakes, barge unloading facilities, or Clifton Court Forebay, the riverbank would not be directly affected by the proposed project. Operations of Alternative 4 and the new preferred alternative, 4A, are not expected to result in a substantial decrease or increase in Delta surface water levels. Please refer to Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Modeling Results, EIR/EIS, for more information.
5068	1	It's a waste of taxpayers money. Let southern California get their water from the ocean.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
5069	1	I'm signing because I've seen the damage being caused.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5070	1	I'm signing because I grew up here in the Delta and don't want to see it destroyed.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5071	1	There are more ecologically sound solutions to dealing with drought conditions in California. It is unethical to divert water from the Sacramento River and other watersheds that feed the Northern California Delta and the San Francisco Bay Estuary. If these bizarre tunnels were built they would diminish water to the estuary. Taking water from northern California to supply southern California's water consumption. In order to mitigate for the significant environmental impacts to the Sacramento River, the Delta, and the San Francisco Bay estuary, we need water and wetlands--which we won't have because we've tunneled the water 300 miles to the south! this is poor environmental management of our precious natural resources.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports), Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply), and Master Response 6 (Demand Management). Although Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A include only those habitat restoration measures needed to provide mitigation for specific regulatory compliance purposes, habitat restoration is still recognized as a critical component of the state's long-term plans for the Delta. Such larger endeavors, however, will likely be implemented over time under actions separate and apart from these alternatives. The primary parallel habitat restoration program is called California EcoRestore, which will be overseen by the California Resources Agency and implemented under the California Water Action Plan.
5071	2	Southern California is a semi-arid and arid/desert environment, and it can no longer sustain uncontrolled urban growth in its cities and towns. It's poor land use planning to build and develop homes and businesses in arid environment areas that don't have an	The comment raises import policy issues concerning sustainable growth and available water supplies in southern California. However, the comment does not question the growth inducement analysis or conclusions of Chapter 30.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		adequate water supply. Therefore, I vigorously oppose a twin-tunnel "solution" to Southern California's water problems.	
5071	3	We have to develop desalinization plants instead and continue our good water conservation efforts. Thank you!	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
5072	1	The waste of resources for dubious outcome. The destruction of land and waters.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5073	1	I'm signing because of the failure to fully consider the interests of the people in the Delta region.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. For more information regarding public outreach efforts please see Master Response 40.
5074	1	The Delta means a lot to me and the rest of Northern California. Please don't take it away.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
5075	1	I like fishing. I think fisherman should have open access to the waters because they pay the taxes for its upkeep and tax dollars should go toward fish culture and biological solutions to the issue.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.
5076	1	It's bad for the state, and the cost is ridiculous.	DWR acknowledges your opposition to the project. Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on the costs of project implementation.
5077	1	Taking water out of the delta will not save the delta	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5078	1	Need fresh water in the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5079	1	The tunnels are only good for a small number of people who live far from the ecological disaster their construction will cause.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
5080	1	We need to keep our resources here in Northern California. Let's break up this state and make it two individual states... right above that city called Bakersfield. We can elect our own Governor... Mr. Brown.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5081	1	Because it is wrong to take our water and send it to southern California	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5082	1	They will be taking my life long home.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. The preferred alternative, 4A, would displace 17 residential structures. When required, the project proponents would provide compensation to property owners for losses due to implementation of the alternative.
5083	1	We send enough water to southern California. They have green lawns, wash their cars, etc., while northern California goes dry. Our farms in northern California need water from the Delta. We need to stop Governor Brown's greedy madness!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. See Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports) and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
5084	1	I grew up in Rio Vista. From age 10 I had my own boat and over the years cruised many miles through the Delta. It is a special estuary that must be preserved.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
5085	1	I want to protect the California delta for my kids to enjoy. The tunnels have too many lasting negative effects in terms of the habitat and wildlife.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5086	1	We boat and fish in the Delta and need to stop causing environmental damage, less government.	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.
5087	1	I'm signing because the Delta is a precious resource that belongs to all Californians--not just a handful of wealthy agribusiness owners in the south valley farming for profit on impaired lands.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project and 44 regarding changes in Delta exports. For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.
5088	1	The Delta is one of the most precious resources on our planet, not just in Bay Area. If we really want to address the drought and water issues, we need to impose a building ban on entire state.	It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
5089	1	The delta is too important to lose! The tunnels will destroy it.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5090	1	I want the Delta to stay the way it is, not be ruined by politicians that could care less about our environment here around 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.
5091	1	I still cannot believe that we have enough water to be carried by 2-- 40' diameter tunnels and that it would ever be so valuable to destroy this amazing Delta landscape!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5092	1	I'm against the tunnels because it is a waste of money and because I believe it will harm the Delta irreparably.	The issue raised 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.
5093	1	I am a fisherman and I think that the Delta tunnels are a bad idea for wildlife in the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5094	1	You cannot continue to pump water south to water a desert. Stop building single family homes in that desert.	<p>As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management). These actions are being considered to meet future water demands for planned municipal uses consistent with water demand projections in the recent Urban Water Management Plans submitted to DWR which include approaches to meet the 20 percent reduction per capita urban water use by 2020.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p>
5095	1	I don't want the Delta degraded and destroyed.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5096	1	This "project" is being rammed down on us. It is politically motivated and payback for political contributions. It will benefit a few with the majority losing on this deal. The environment will suffer. Recreational opportunities and the fishing industry will suffer. From what I understand, we can't even vote. Untrustworthy politicians are making the decision for us? This is not right. I am against this project. Shame on the few who stand to benefit promoting this project.	<p>The comment pertains to the decision making process, who would benefit from the project, and adverse ecosystem, social, and economic effects.</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 overall recreation experience for boaters or fishermen in the vicinity of intake construction areas would</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>be reduced during construction activities because of the elevated noise levels as well as visual setting disruptions. These temporary construction-related effects would last for up to 5 years in the vicinity of intake and barge unloading facilities and could alter fish populations such that recreational fishing opportunities in the study area would be affected. Weekday construction would reduce the amount of fish and other wildlife in recreation areas in the vicinity of the intakes, resulting in decreased recreation opportunities related to wildlife and fish, causing recreationists to experience a changed recreation setting. Chapter 15 describes potential impacts on on-water recreation and fishing. Mitigation Measures would reduce impacts on marine navigation by developing and implementing site-specific construction traffic management plans; installing visual barriers between construction work areas and sensitive receptors; applying aesthetic design treatments to all structures; and employing noise-reducing construction practices. The potential impact on covered and non-covered sport fish species from construction activities would be considered less than significant because the proposed project would include environmental commitments (Appendix 3B). Mitigation Measures would also be available to reduce construction-related underwater noise and pile driving effects, to initiate a complaint/response program, and to provide alternative bank fishing access sites. Please see Chapter 16 Socioeconomics of the Public Draft BDCP for additional information regarding economic impacts to marinas.</p> <p>For more information on the project evaluation and decision making process, please see Master Response 72.</p>
5097	1	I'm signing because the fiscal costs far exceed the benefit. I also think the environmental impacts are too large.	DWR acknowledges your opposition to the project. Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on the costs of project implementation.
5098	1	We need more reservoirs to store additional water not steal Delta water and destroy the estuary and bay.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>Future reservoir projects are still undergoing evaluation or review, including potential surface water reservoir projects and groundwater storage projects. Therefore, potential storage projects are only considered in the EIR/S as cumulative impact projects (please see Master Response 37). It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p> <p>The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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).
5099	1	I am against taking more water and sending it to Southern California to fill their pools and water their golf courses.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water) and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
5100	1	We need more storage, not depletion of existing waterways.	<p>It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project. Rather, the scope and purpose of the proposed project is much more limited. As explained in Chapter 2 Project Objectives and Purpose and Need of the Final EIR/EIS, the fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the State Water Project (SWP) system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and Central Valley Project (CVP) south-of-Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework with statutory and contractual obligations. Please see Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p> <p>Additional water storage was eliminated from consideration in the Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS through the alternatives development and screening process (discussed in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives). As such, the proposed project does not propose storage as a project component. Although the proposed project would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, Alternative 4A is a stand-alone project which demonstrates independent utility just as future storage projects would demonstrate. Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives) and Master Response 37 (Storage) for additional information.</p> <p>The plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Although the project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented California WaterFix project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports) for further information on water exporting under the proposed project.</p>
5101	1	Taking more water from the Delta does not fix the Delta, it will destroy it!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. 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).

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5102	1	I oppose the Delta Tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5103	1	I object to the tunnels because this so called "fix" ignores alternatives and does not meet the restoration goals in the Delta Reform Act. We must protect our environment, natural resources and agriculture in the Delta.	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 (Alternatives Development) and Master Response 10 (Delta Reform Act) for additional information.</p>
5104	1	This is bull! Taking water from northern California and spending tons of money doing so. Do not do this.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5105	1	We need to save our Delta waters	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5106	1	The tunnels are only to be used so that LA can steal our water. All politicians consider Southern California the most important part of this state, because that is where the monied support is.	As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the Clean Water Act and federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. 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.
5107	1	The Delta Tunnels will further destroy the already fragile Delta ecosystem	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5108	1	Tunneling will totally disrupt the Delta for big Ag. No way should they be moving water to the area southwest of 5, it is not meant to be irrigated.	<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 26 (Changes in Delta Exports) and Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
5109	1	These tunnels are a giveaway to southern California, and a disaster for our water.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5110	1	Brown is an idiot and hates the environment.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5111	1	I'm signing because I care about other creatures--those that can't vote or speak out--whose existence depends on Delta water flowing naturally as it has for millennia.	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.
5112	1	We must stop this insane proposal to steal water from the north and give it to the south--at a discount.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply), and Master Response 6 (Demand Management).
5113	1	I am signing because I want to protect the Delta and fisheries and the Delta way of life.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5114	1	I'm opposed to the tunnels. Save our Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5115	1	We need to focus on water consumption, not diverting more water for trivial use at the detriment of the environment.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Appendix 1C of the Final EIR/EIS, Demand Management Measures, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. Refer to Master Response 6 for more information on demand management. Although components such as demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the State, they are beyond the scope of the project.
5116	1	My water tastes horrible and is making our family sick. We want to go back to our old river water source and not the algae-infested lake we are forced to drink from due to drought and sending our water south!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS.
5117	1	Greedy politicians keep selling northern California water to line their pockets. They aren't solving the drought, they're creating more problems.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5118	1	The Delta should be left alone otherwise it will be detrimentally affected and the people of California along with it. This is a long standing issue, since the 1960s, I believe. I was against it then and am still against it. This is a very bad idea.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5119	1	This is just another bad idea. It will ruin our delta. Focus on making water storages and alternate water holding sites.	<p>It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 (Demand Management) for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Master Response 37 (Storage) addresses why additional water storage was eliminated from consideration in the Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS through the alternatives development and screening process (discussed in Master Response 4 [Alternatives] and in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives). As such, the proposed project does not propose storage as a project component. Although the proposed project would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, Alternative 4A is a stand-alone project which demonstrates independent utility just as future storage projects would demonstrate.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			The California WaterFix (referred to in the FEIR/FEIS as Alternative 4A) is DWR's preferred alternative under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Reclamation's preferred alternative under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Alternative 4A addresses the reverse flow problem by focusing on the construction and operation of new north Delta intakes and on habitat restoration commensurate with the footprint of these new facilities. The construction and operation of new conveyance facilities would help resolve many of the concerns with the current south Delta conveyance system while otherwise helping to reduce threats to endangered and threatened species in the Delta through habitat restoration, as necessary to mitigate significant environmental effects and satisfy applicable ESA and CESA standards. Implementing a dual conveyance system, in which water could be diverted from either the north or the south or both, depending on the needs of aquatic organisms, would align water operations to better reflect natural seasonal flow patterns by creating new water diversions in the north Delta equipped with state-of-the-art fish screens. The new system would reduce the ongoing physical impacts associated with sole reliance on the southern diversion facilities and allow for greater operational flexibility to better protect fish. Minimizing south Delta pumping would provide more natural east–west flow patterns. The new diversions would also help protect critical water supplies against the threats of sea level rise and earthquakes. Please refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) for additional information.
5120	1	No tunnels, they will never work.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5121	1	There are alternative solutions that are less expensive and far less environmentally destructive.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. 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.
5122	1	It is a boondoggle.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5123	1	I am signing because I am recreational fisherman and I do not want the Bay and Delta waterways negatively impacted by the Tunnels or other projects.	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.
5124	1	Save the Delta waterway.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5125	1	Because I live on the Delta. You have nothing better to do but ruin quote.. The Delta? Put your time and money into crime and homeless. Really, what will you gain from this? Not your job for long anyways.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the CEQA and NEPA documents were raised.
5126	1	A waste of money and detrimental to the health of the Delta.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5127	1	You will destroy our Delta, rivers, streams and estuaries. This is just plain wrong.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5128	1	Our water feeds the world. You cannot water with salt water.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
5129	1	I am signing because I do not think the tunnels are a good solution to California's water problems.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5130	1	We cannot let Jerry Brown and friends destroy the Delta. If Jerry wants to lay pipe he can start with boat part of I-5 downtown Sacramento. They rebuilt the cement walls and road surface but the pipes are rotting more each day. By the way, how is that new Bay Bridge working out?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5131	1	The state needs to build more water capture areas in Southern California for Southern California.	Additional water storage was eliminated from consideration in the Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS through the alternatives development and screening process (discussed in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives). As such, the proposed project does not propose storage as a project component. Although the proposed project would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, Alternative 4A is a stand-alone project which demonstrates independent utility just as future storage projects would demonstrate. Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives) and Master Response 37 (Storage) for additional information.
5132	1	The Delta is important for so many reasons. It needs to be protected. The California Delta brings life to humans and wildlife alike!	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.
5133	1	I am signing this petition so that the already strained California Delta has a chance at recovery and sustainability. We really should concentrate more on the water hyacinth problem before it chokes all life out.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5134	1	I live in the San Joaquin Valley and this action will destroy our farmlands forever. This cannot be allowed to happen.	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.
5135	1	We need to save this natural system of clean water. We need to save it to show how it works naturally making it an example to recreate, duplicate then restore. The water tunnels will drain the watershed that usually flows through the Sacramento/San Joaquin Valley. We should be bringing to forward the drainage of the biggest lake west of the Mississippi, Tule Lake. What happened to it? It was totally trained because of mismanagement of water.	Operation of the project water delivery system could not drain the Delta rivers and channels dry, including the Sacramento River. The project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. 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. Deliveries to in-Delta senior water rights users are the same under the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and all action alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS in accordance with existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. 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/S. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html).
5136	1	This action will devastate the Delta forever. Stop it now!	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.
5137	1	I want the Delta protected.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5138	1	I believe this is a huge mistake, both from an environmental and fiscal point of view.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding).
5139	1	Do not screw with Mother Nature. Hands off 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.
5140	1	Having grown up and lived in the Sacramento Valley, I know the ecological importance of the Delta. I fished in these waters, hunted waterfowl on them, and ate food grown from its soil. It is unethical to destroy one environment in order to allow another unsustainable environment to continue sucking resources from the rest of the state (Los Angeles and its surrounding areas).	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply), and Master Response 6 (Demand Management).
5141	1	I am signing because I think it is wrong to take water from the Northern California farmers to send south so they can grow produce to export. We are in a drought and the farmers here in Northern California needs this water! Jerry (moonbeam) Brown, thinks he can ram this down our throats! Follow the money people! Who financially wins and who ecologically loses.	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.
5142	1	It is more critical to stop over-building and over-population, and create sustainable models for both residential and business communities.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5143	1	Because it is destorying the public commons and nature for private gain.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5144	1	I live in the Delta and do not want the nature destroyed.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5145	1	Unrestricted growth in Southern California is no reason to rape the ecosystems of Northern California. Owens Valley II must not happen.	<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>Regulatory laws and conditions are much different today, and they make it impossible for one region to take advantage of another to such a degree. Under the stringent environmental statutes in place today, including the Endangered Species Act, operation of the proposed water delivery system could not drain the Delta rivers and channels dry, including the Sacramento River. The proposed project's facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants, would be operated in accordance with permits issued by, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the State Water Resources Control Board, among other agencies. The proposed project would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards.</p>
5146	1	I oppose the Delta tunnels for environmental, public health and economic reasons. Governor Brown is wrong about the need for these tunnels and what they would theoretically achieve.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Chapter 25 (Public Health) of the Final EIR/EIS for information on public health impacts and mitigation for these impacts and Chapter 16 for information on economic impacts on the Delta and mitigation for these impacts.
5147	1	We need our water in Northern California to stay here.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5148	1	Our planet is our home and the Delta is our immediate home. The destruction the tunnels will cause in an effort to make money will be irreparable.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).
5149	1	The tunnels would not benefit the citizens of California and would harm the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5150	1	I believe the tunnels are just wrong and do not fix our water. We need more storage facilities, now.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5151	1	This would destroy the Delta fishery.	The commenter does not offer any evidence on how the project would result in aquatic impacts related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5152	1	Stop the tunnels and save the Delta. The Delta infrastructure is too sensitive to have its water shipped away.	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.
5153	1	These tunnels will destroy the Delta in so many ways that far outweigh the small benefits they will provide.	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.
5154	1	The tunnels are a horrendous idea. We opposed them in 1986 and should oppose them forever! Some things know the name of progress should never happen. This is one them! There are other ways to combat the droughts California has every so often.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5155	1	These extreme proposals are not the solution to southern California's water needs.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5156	1	I like to fish in the Delta for freshwater fish. Not saltwater.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required. Please refer to Master Response 14 regarding salinity. The preferred alternative, 4A, would be anticipated to result in less than significant effects on fish and water quality related to salinity, which would result in less than significant effects on fishing from a recreation perspective.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5157	1	We must stop these tunnels. Preserve the Delta. Let the dummies who choose to live in the desert, build desalination plants and pay for their water! Leave ours alone.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
5158	1	We love our Delta waterways and so do the wildlife that live there. I want these waters to remain for my grandchildren and their children, etc.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5159	1	Because we do not need another way to siphon water off - we need a way to restore the groundwater. The Central Valley is sinking 2 inches per month for lack of water, which means it will be unable to refill. Just stop!	As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The proposed project would not include conveyance of groundwater and would not result in reductions in SWP and CVP water deliveries under the proposed project as compared to the No Action Alternative; and therefore, would not affect groundwater elevations north of the Delta.
5160	1	I am an organic farmer, fisherman, and conservationist; the tunnels are a bad idea.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5161	1	This is just wrong and greedy! I am so disappointed in Governor Brown for doing this! He has been great until this action.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5162	1	Stop the tunnels!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5163	1	I am signing because the Delta and San Francisco estuaries are an incredibly important part of our state and ecosystem. Save the estuaries! No to the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5164	1	The twin tunnel Water Fix project is not the only option. It is the worst option.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5165	1	I am tired of the southern part of the state stealing water from us while they refuse to build dams to store rain water to use for watering their grass while our lawns have died in our efforts to conserve water. They think they are entitled to the water from our rivers enough. Stop the theft before we in northern California live in a desert also.	Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
5166	1	Salt water is already intruding. It is killing trees, bushes. The water is not safe to drink the livestock. Taking more water from the environment will be completely destroyed ecologically and financially.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
5167	1	I oppose the Delta Tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5168	1	The California Delta is crucial for both our environment and people as well as the farmland. Please do not ruin it!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5169	1	I want the tunnels stopped now.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5170	1	This will devastate the natural and cultural resources that will negatively be impacted by this project. The area of this proposed project is sensitive to many Native American Tribes within the area. I say no the Tunnels! Save our water, save our salmon!	<p>The commenter's opinion related to the DEIR/S is acknowledged. This comment regarding 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.</p> <p>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>
5171	1	I am signing to preserve the last deltas we have in the United States.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5172	1	Not a good idea, it will ruin the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5173	1	We need to protect the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5174	1	We should not bow to the corporate agribusinesses that are sucking our aquifers dry and poisoning our sacred waterways and communities with petrochemicals. We have more sustainable ways of dealing with the water crisis that strengthen community resilience and guarantee the human right to water.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights. Deliveries to in-Delta senior water rights users are the same under the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and all action alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS in accordance with existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), 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.
5175	1	I have cousins living in California, who have told me about their opposition to these tunnels. One of them is an engineer knowledgeable about water conservation. And, as I understand it, water will be diverted from fresh water drinking sources in order to irrigate crops growing on arid and inappropriate soil.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5176	1	I am a fisherman and I care about our diminishing fish population.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5177	1	Does not California have enough problems without the corporate bigwigs exploiting them to death? Seriously, the people who live on the Delta are perfectly fine the tunnels.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5178	1	The Delta is home to many wildlife and sailors.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5179	1	I watched the peripheral canals cause salt intrusion. This would be even worse. Stop trying to live on and farm the desert.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS.
5180	1	Destroying one economy to benefit another is unacceptable. Science shows conclusive evidence that the environmental damage done to the Delta by the over diversion of flows impacts the Pacific Ocean as well.	All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, water quality standards, and Delta outflows from the Delta to San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean (see Appendix 5A, Section C, of the EIR/EIS).
5181	1	The tunnels will ruin the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5182	1	Governor Brown, you are upsetting the natural river life that has been here for thousands of years, maybe millions. Please do not upset the ecosystem.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5183	1	Save the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5184	1	I am signing because of the negative impact this will have to the Delta ecosystems and all the different fisheries; I also feel that this is being pushed by special interest groups for their won selfish personal gains.	The issue raised 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.
5185	1	I am signing because this is a terrible idea with no scientific backing and will only destroy the Delta and all those that live near it.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies,

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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>
5186	1	I am signing because doing damage to an ecosystem to help another damaged ecosystem does not solve anything! Please do not build these tunnels. I (we) do not want them.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
5187	1	I fish and boat on the Delta and I want my grandchildren and their children to be able to do the same.	Impacts to boating are discussed in Impacts REC-3 and 7. Please refer to Impacts 4, 5, and 9 regarding impacts to fishing.
5188	1	I am signing because I strongly oppose diverting water for unsustainable causes! Each locale needs to learn to live with the resources directly available to them. Also, the ecology of the Delta needs to be protected for the good of the people and wildlife that are in direct contact with the area.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Appendix 1C of the Final EIR/EIS, Demand Management Measures, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. Refer to Master Response 6 for more information on demand management.
5189	1	The only real California Water Fix is the restoration of California's degraded ecosystems and investment in resilient, water-smart agriculture. Industrial or great infrastructure "fixes: just push the problem down the line at massive taxpayer expenses.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. 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.
5190	1	Taking more freshwater out of this system will continue to erode the ecosystem in the Delta. The latest budgets have slashed the restoration funds in order to bring the price down. It is a lose/lose for everyone except the downstate utilities.	A primary goal of the BDCP would be to restore wetlands and protect Delta habitats. However, please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. The preferred alternative includes AMMs for reducing impacts and mitigation measures compensating for significant impacts on wetlands and habitats, but wetland restoration would take place under a separate program, California EcoRestore. Chapter 11 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses measures to protect aquatic ecosystem, and Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses measures to protect terrestrial ecosystems. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports).
5191	1	Water is not a political tool.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5192	1	A tunnel is not much different from a canal. Growing alfalfa and rice in the desert is wasteful and stupid, even if you have been doing it since your grandpa was a baby.	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.
5193	1	I am signing because it will reduce the water in the Delta, which already threaten the survival of fishes like salmon and Delta smelt.	As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. The proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high to improve conditions for aquatic resources in the Delta. As shown in Appendix 5A, Section C, Delta outflow would be similar under the proposed project as compared to the No Action Alternative.
5194	1	Because we need to save the Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5195	1	I am an avid California fisherman, and am signing this petition to stop the further destruction of the San Francisco Bay Delta environment by water-grabbing agricultural and South California interests, who do not care or realize of the irreversible of such a large-scale plan.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply), and Master Response 6 (Demand Management).
5196	1	To all of you that care, I live on the Delta and I assure you can not afford to divert any more water, if we do it is cutting our own throats.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.</p> <p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5197	1	Tunnels ruin the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5198	1	Enough is enough! The tunnels are not the answer to our water issues and cost way too much!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Cost).
5199	1	I am not tired of the water grab, that will destroy the Delta ecosystem.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.</p> <p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.</p>
5200	1	I am opposed because of the absurdity of the plan. Southern California is classified as a desert climate; no residential lawns, heavily restricted golf course usage, residential water restricted by number of persons in a household with meters that will stop the flow when the limit is reached regardless of resident's ability to pay high costs, restricting the amount of water to agribusinesses in the San Joaquin Valley on land that was classified as marginal years ago by UC Davis and could only be farmed by using large amounts of water. Will money win out over common sense.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply). 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.
5201	1	This project does not create one gallon of water, costs are out of line let alone the overrun cost factor, environmentally the project is unsound. The San Francisco/ Delta/Bay region will never recover if the project goes forward. The monies projected for the project are better spent on alternative water development and creation, such as reservoirs and desalination. California needs to create and store water not move it from one location to another.	<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. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <p>Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the project would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p> <p>For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 7 for information on Demand Management.</p>
5202	1	This is not in the best interests of California. There are more practical ways of dealing with water shortages. And sending more water south for the agricultural business is not one of them.	<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>
5203	1	This is a total waste of our tax dollars! We need the Delta to keep San Francisco Bay healthy. Fix the levees to protect our homes.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
5204	1	<p>I am signing this petition because the Delta needs more fresh water, not less, to preserve fisheries and Delta farming.</p> <p>The unintended consequences of the project will be huge. Think of Louisiana's eroding wetlands after the Mississippi River project in the 1930's.</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>The range of alternatives in the EIR/EIS includes alternatives which result in reductions in SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta as compared to the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative and Alternatives 4H1, 4H2, 4H3, 4H4; 5; 6A, 6B, 6C; 7; 8; and 9 would result in less SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta than under Existing Conditions (shown in Tables 5-5 and 5-8). Similarly, Alternatives 6A, 6B, 6C; 7; 8; and 9 would result in less SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta than under the No Action Alternative (shown in Tables 5-6 and 5-9). However, SWP and CVP water deliveries would continue under all alternatives.</p> <p>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5205	1	I believe in saving the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5206	1	I am opposed to the construction of the Delta tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5207	1	I am signing because draining the largest estuary on the west coast and sending its water south does not fix California's water woes. This plan will destroy fisheries, farms and recreation in the Delta.	<p>Operation of the project water delivery system could not drain the Delta rivers and channels dry, including the Sacramento River. The project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. 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. Deliveries to in-Delta senior water rights users are the same under the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and all action alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS in accordance with existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. 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/S. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html).</p> <p>Considerations of adverse impacts to agricultural water users due to implementation of the action alternatives (not climate change, sea level rise, or projected population growth that would have occurred with or without the proposed project) are discussed in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources. Changes in Delta water quality that could affect agricultural water users are discussed in Chapter 8, Water Quality, including changes in bromide, chloride, and electrical conductivity. As discussed in Chapter 15, Recreation, the action alternatives are not expected to result in a substantial decrease or increase in Delta surface water levels.</p>
5208	1	I am signing because the canal does nothing to heal and restore the Delta environment and instead provides a water transport infrastructure to deliver water to known water wasters in the southern and central parts of the state. Give the water back to nature and restore the largest estuary on the Pacific Coast.	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
5209	1	With not enough water for the North state as it is, these tunnels would deplete our Sacramento River and Delta water system of the much needed water to maintain an already struggling environment. No tunnels.	<p>Operation of the project water delivery system could not drain the Delta rivers and channels dry, including the Sacramento River. The project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. 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. Deliveries to in-Delta senior water rights users are the same under the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and all action alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS in accordance with existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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/S. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html).
5210	1	Do not do it! We have already messed up the environment beyond comprehension, let us restore the Delta and salmon runs, not support big agriculture.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5211	1	The negative consequences of this plan would be profound and far reaching. Please take time to fully understand the complexity of the Delta estuary.	<p>Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
5212	1	I strongly oppose the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5213	1	I love the Delta and do not want to see it destroyed so a few can profit. Leave our beautiful waterways alone.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5214	1	The tunnels will destroy the Delta. Please do not mess with mother nature on the one! It will be irreversible.	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.
5215	1	I oppose the California Water Fix, it is a waste of money and it would destroy our 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.
5216	1	The tunnels are a horrible idea, an environmental nightmare put forward by greedy, shortsighted individuals who choose to live in a desert, then complain about the lack of water there. Build some desalination plants in Southern California and leave Northern California alone.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
5217	1	As a long time Northern Californian I feel this will be a disaster for our Delta. We are sinking , we need our water table filled, not sent south.	As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service,

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The proposed project would not include conveyance of groundwater and would not result in reductions in SWP and CVP water deliveries under the proposed project as compared to the No Action Alternative; and therefore, would not affect groundwater elevations north of the Delta.
5218	1	<p>I am opposed to Governor Brown's effort to push for a so-called fix to California's water problems.</p> <p>Not surprisingly when the California legislature passed the Peripheral Canal bill in 1980, it was the Governor Brown who signed the Peripheral Canal bill into law.</p> <p>Despite this, several weeks later the legislature put Proposition 8, (proposed amendment to the California State Constitution that would protect the Delta and rivers of the North Coast) on the ballot. In November 1980 voters approved this measure.</p> <p>In 1982 canal supporters were successful in Proposition 9 on this ballot; this measure would have allowed the construction of a canal and other water diversion facilities. Fortunately for the people of California the voters soundly defeated this measure.</p> <p>Jerry Brown in a June 2010 campaign speech to technology executives acknowledged that he would probably make some new mistakes but affirmed that he would not repeat the old ones. (Sacramento Bee, 9/12/10)</p> <p>Unfortunately the governor is not keeping this promise. He is unfortunately probably making the worst mistake of his political career.</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. Refer to Master Response 35 (Peripheral Canal).
5219	1	This will destroy our Delta, nothing more than a water grab for Southern California.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project and the action alternatives do 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.
5220	1	We have already destroyed the majority of the natural surrounding in the Bay Area. We need to save what precious little we have left.	Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect natural communities. The chapter describes the impacts, both negative and positive, and discusses the mitigation measures and avoidance and minimization measures proposed to avoid, minimize, and compensate for any significant impacts.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5221	1	Do not destroy the Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5222	1	I live on the Delta, on a boat on the Delta, and I have followed all the info on the tunnels, it is a very short-sighted and short-lasting fix, and it will destroy this region that I love.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
5223	1	Brown's tunnel will kill the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5224	1	I am signing because salmon, steelhead, trout and all other species dependent on cold, clean water need a voice.	For information about effects of the preferred alternative, Alternative 4A, on salmonids and sturgeon, please see Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Resources, which indicates that effects would not be adverse. T
5225	1	Tunnels will destroy agriculture, ecosystem and way of life in Northern California. Tunnels are so unfair for Northern California.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria 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. Also refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 18 (Agricultural impact Mitigation).
5226	1	I am sick and tired of people screwing with the natural environment!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5227	1	Stop stealing water and gumming up the works for the locals.	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 and the action alternatives do 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.
5228	1	I am signing this petition because our population cannot survive on saltwater and the governor does not care about the people or environment of Northern California.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5229	1	Why cannot we use all hat money to invest in water storage in Southern California.	Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5230	1	Save our beautiful wildlife and agriculture, this is where I was born and choose to live my entire life! No tunnels.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5231	1	These tunnels are a horrible idea.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5232	1	I oppose the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5233	1	I love the California Delta and the fish species she holds. If we eradicate the Delta and turn it into water tunnels, it be the most asinine thing that California has ever thought of. There has got to be another way instead of resorting to something like this. Restore and save our beautiful Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5234	1	We need to find another way instead of destroying one of California's most beloved fisheries.	The commenter does not offer any evidence on how the project would result in aquatic impacts related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5235	1	It is a scientific fact that every time water is taken from an area where it is plentiful to service the needs of a desert area, where it is not. Two deserts result. The tunnels are not the answer to this problem humans have created in their stubborn resistance to nature.	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 and the action alternatives do 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.
5236	1	It will cause more damage to the ecosystem. And that could be irreversible.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Chapter 11 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect aquatic ecosystems. Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect terrestrial ecosystems. Both chapters describe the impacts, both negative and positive, and discuss the mitigation measures and avoidance and minimization measures proposed to avoid and minimize impacts and to compensate for significant impacts.
5237	1	Farmers cannot raise crops using salt water, cattle cannot drink salt water.	Effects of the alternatives on salinity levels are described in Chapter 8, Water Quality, and Appendix 8H, Electrical Conductivity, EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Modeling results indicate that the implementation of the water conveyance facilities may positively or adversely affect in-Delta water quality,

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>depending on a number of factors including location, time of year, and hydrologic conditions. See tables in Appendices 8E through 8N for specific results related to various water quality constituents (including bromide and chloride).</p> <p>In addition to potential effects associated with the project and alternatives, modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the proposed project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 14, Water Quality, for more details regarding effects of the alternatives on salinity levels.</p>
5238	1	Oppose the tunnel	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5239	1	I do not want the tunnels to happen!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5240	1	I care about the Bay Area and Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5241	1	I oppose the tunnels and want to protect the Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5242	1	Bad idea, not right that Southern California should take Northern California water, enough is enough.	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 and the action alternatives do 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.
5243	1	I love the Delta and all the wildlife there that has evolved with area over the years.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
5244	1	I am signing because I believe redirecting water would harm the environment, water supply for drinking and local population's economy. Please do not take water to give to over-thirsty crops, like almond trees, that inappropriate to plant in the region.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). The proposed project would not increase the amount of water to which SWP and CVP hold water rights for use allowed under their contracts and permits and approvals for refuge water supplies or other environmental purposes.</p>
5245	1	I am signing because I am totally opposed to the twin tunnels. They definitely should not be built, period.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5246	1	Last time we had an El Nino during a drought they shipped excess rain water from lakes right into the ocean. Northern California did not send any excess water down unless there was a financial gain involved with a sale. How is this expensive project affordable to the government? Politicians make water big business. It has nothing to do the helping the California drought. They simply want to control more of the entire state's water. They control our water and our fuel. Less water for famers = more power the government has on our food supply. The more control they have = the more power they have. California population is growing. We have to reduce our use of daily water. Ironically, now they are trying to raise the cost of water in cities that use id down! Wake up California.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. It is not the result of "favoring" large corporations (e.g., large agribusinesses). In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Change in Delta Exports), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
5247	1	I live in Northern California and this plan is criminal. Why is it that Southern California is always making plans for Northern California. Where are all the environmental pushers when it comes to the destruction of the Delta?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS..
5248	1	We cannot afford to kill the remaining environment. Invest in schools not tunnels!!!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5249	1	Tunnels are a horrible idea meant to obfuscate--that more conventional storage needs to be created.	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 and the action alternatives do 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). Please see Master Response 37 that discusses approaches to increase storage in California.</p>
5250	1	Bad policy, bad science.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5251	1	I do not agree the tunnels are not a solution but as bigger problem down the road.	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.
5252	1	So. Cal. already gets a huge amount of water from Nor. Cal. They need to look into more ways to conserve.	<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 and the action alternatives do 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 Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).</p>
5253	1	I want the Delta to be repaired, not suffer further devastation. I want salmon to be able to swim up the rivers with the ability for their fry to return to the ocean. I want our water to take care of Northern California's farm needs and the needs of our own populace. You are having our people conserve water and go without while Southern Californians are not conserving water. Someone in Bel Air, Calif used 11.8 million gallons of water in one year and this was just one property with a private home. Why are they not being made to conserve and the people in our area are made to do without? This needs to be repaired. No to the tunnels that will further rape the Delta watershed.	Water conservation is one part of the larger California Water Action Plan. Please see: http://resources.ca.gov/docs/california_water_action_plan/Final_California_Water_Action_Plan.pdf

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5254	1	We need to preserve what little wildlife we have left!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5255	1	We don't want the tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5256	1	Northern California's rain belongs to Northern California.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project and the action alternatives do not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.
5257	1	I believe in preserving natural habitat and animals lives.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5258	1	Northern California needs our water, we feed America.	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.
5259	1	I live in this area and know first hand what irreversible damage this will cause to our already endangered Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5260	1	I worry about my children not having the Delta like it was when I was growing up in Stockton.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. For more information regarding Delta as a Place please see Master Response 24.
5261	1	Just a stupid idea.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5262	1	The Delta is crucial to the people and farmland of California. Diverting water through the tunnels will destroy the Delta, not preserve it.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5263	1	I support NorCal and the Delta. Save the fish!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5264	1	I am a professional as well as recreational boater on the Delta. Impacts to water quality and depths directly effect my livelihood and my family's recreation. We are training the next generation of stewards of our waters - for all to enjoy and thrive.	Operations of the new preferred alternative, 4A, are not expected to result in a substantial decrease or increase in Delta surface water levels. Please refer to Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Modeling Results, EIR/EIS, for more information. As described in Impact REC-4 for 4A, constructing water intakes, siphons, operable barrier construction and use of barge unloading facilities during tunnel/pipeline construction would result in temporary water quality effects (e.g., turbidity, accidental spills, disturbance of

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			contaminated sediments). DWR has made a commitment to prevent water quality effects through environmental training; implement stormwater pollution prevention plans, erosion and sediment control plans, hazardous materials management plans, and spill prevention, containment, and countermeasure plans; dispose of spoils, RTM, and dredged material (RTM would be removed from RTM storage areas and reused, as appropriate, as bulking material for levee maintenance, as fill material for habitat restoration projects, or other beneficial means of reuse identified for the material); implement a noise abatement plan; and implement a barge operations plan (Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs).
5265	1	It is simple, these tunnels will destroy what we now know as a Delta wetlands without providing a drop of without draining resevors upstream therfore creating annual water shortages for people and farmers alike in northern California.	Operation of the project water delivery system could not drain the Central Valley reservoirs and Delta rivers and channels dry, including the Sacramento River. The project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. 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. Deliveries to in-Delta senior water rights users are the same under the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and all action alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS in accordance with existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. 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/S. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html).
5266	1	I care about the environment, but most of all I care about my home and the place I grew up.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
5267	1	I am not in favor of the underground Delta Tunnels which was originally rejected by the voters as the peripheral canal in 1982.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5268	1	I love the Delta and the thousands of mile of water way and the amount of freedom that I feel while out there fishing and there is truly nothing more than I love than my freedoms and I'll be damned if some big wigs want to take that from me for a few bucks in their pockets.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. Fishing would still be accessible throughout the Delta during construction, although it would be restricted in the direct vicinity of construction areas. Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass, and to Impacts REC-2, 4, 5, and 9 for a discussion of impacts to fishing from the proposed project, as well as Alternative 4A in Chapter 15, Recreation, Impacts REC-3 and 7 regarding boating.
5269	1	I am signing this petition because Governor Brown, you put a whole new meaning to Rule #5! You are an idiot! How dare you cause more harm to our waterways! How about using some of that supposed money you speak to help out our homeless families, foster homes, etc. The community as a whole is enraged that you would	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		ignore people in such a way that you are willing to cause more harm and pain to us! Rule #5!	salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5270	1	You will be taking water away from a rich, proven, and productive farming area to water a salt ridden desert and then flush the salt runoff back through the Delta and San Francisco Bay and polluting that area.	<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 and the action alternatives do not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.</p> <p>Overall, the average annual Delta exports are less in Alternatives 2, 4 (H2, H3, H4), and 5 through 9 than under Existing Conditions, as shown in Figure 5-17 of Chapter 5, Water Supply, of the EIR/EIS. Therefore, return and drainage flows from agricultural users located south of the Delta would be similar or less than under the Existing Conditions.</p>
5271	1	We need to restore our waterways not destroy them.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5272	1	Please do not destroy one of California's most beautiful natural resource.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5273	1	We simply don't have the water to spare. Get us extra water from Washington State and we'll pass more to Los Angeles, fair?	<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 and the action alternatives do not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).</p>
5274	1	Northern and central California needs more water I took a flight across california the central and northern part are brow and black with little green areas down southern California they do not save water like we do. Its all green small areas of brown and the have all the water fountains turned with out any cares they need to start water saving as well and stop taking water from other areas.	<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 and the action alternatives do not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5275	1	I strongly disagree with the idea of the Delta Tunnels. It is about as good an idea as bringing in manatees to solve the hyacinth problem. Absurd!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5276	1	This won't help the water situation and I'm tired.	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.
5277	1	I live near the Delta and want to protect it.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
5278	1	I want to save the San Francisco Bay Delta estuary.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5279	1	This is deceit at the highest levels of State government-allow this kind of an expenditure in the billions without citizens being able to decide. This will not solve water issues but continue the outright thievery of water contractors and politicians of the most valuable resource in the state.	<p>For both environmental and economic reasons, there is an urgent need to improve and modernize the existing SWP/CVP conveyance system, which was designed and built decades ago. The ecological problems with the current system could be greatly reduced by the construction and use of new north Delta intake structures with state-of-the-art fish screens. With this future vision in mind, DWR and several state and federal water contractors, in coordination with the Bureau of Reclamation, proposed a strategy for restoring ecological functions in the Delta while improving water supply reliability in California.</p> <p>Since 2006, the BDCP/California WaterFix has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. All of the documents, studies, administrative drafts, and meeting materials—more than 3,000 documents—have been posted online since 2010 in an unprecedented commitment to public access and government transparency.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 for more information on the purpose and need for this project, and Master Response 41 for a discussion on public involvement and government transparency.</p>
5280	1	I oppose the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5281	1	We must protect our waterways.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5282	1	This will be a hugh disaster for all! It must be stopped.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5283	1	The Central Valley has unique soil; prime agricultural land. I have watched much of it being paved over the years. Subtract the two canals already in use and back-pumping water. The Delta is critical to the ecosystem and economic stability. Please review Mr. Hildebrand's notes and reconsider devastating our region.	<p>Chapter 16 of the EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A (Socioeconomics) identifies the unique features of the Delta and describes the potential effects on Delta communities. Impacts to agriculture are identified and discussed in Chapter 14; project proponents have proposed measures that would support and protect agricultural production in the Delta by securing agricultural easements and/or by seeking opportunities to protect and enhance agriculture with a focus on maintaining economic activity on agricultural lands.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
5284	1	No Tunnel, it will destroy a lot of the nature and fishing habitat and I believe our kids have the right to fish on the Delta before it gets destroyed.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5285	1	I believe we need to keep our water where it is.	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 and the action alternatives do not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.
5286	1	Our Delta is an important delicate ecosystem and what has been done with the canal is already too much.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Chapter 11 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect aquatic ecosystems. Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect terrestrial ecosystems. Both chapters describe the impacts, both negative and positive, and discuss the mitigation measures and avoidance and minimization measures proposed to avoid and minimize impacts and to compensate for significant impacts.
5287	1	Delta water shouldn't be used to grow cotton in the desert.	State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 4 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via proposed conveyance facilities.
5288	1	This is one of the most important deltas in the world and nurtures the life of the ocean. Restore, don't destroy.	A primary goal of the BDCP would be to restore wetlands and protect Delta habitats. However, please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. The preferred alternative includes AMMs for reducing impacts and mitigation measures compensating for significant impacts on wetlands and habitats, but wetland restoration would take place under a separate program, California EcoRestore. Chapter 11 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses measures to protect aquatic ecosystem, and Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses measures to protect terrestrial ecosystems.
5289	1	It will be detrimental, environmental, public health, and economic concerns.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5290	1	We do not have enough water for us here in the bay and you want to export more stop building in places that cannot support their population.	<p>As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management). These actions are being considered to meet future water demands for planned municipal uses consistent with water demand projections in the recent Urban Water Management Plans submitted to DWR which include approaches to meet the 20 percent reduction per</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			capita urban water use by 2020. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5291	1	I am signing because this project will effect not only our environment, but also many peoples lively hoods, not to mention the astronomical cost.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5292	1	It's a waste of money! It's going to damage our environment! It's not going to fix our water problem!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5293	1	I value the contribution the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta makes to the quality of life for all inhabitants of the State of California. If we reduce the flow of fresh water to this sensitive region we risk destruction of an irreplaceable resource.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor any change in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. 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. 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.
5294	1	The delta tunnels will kill northern California completely and ruin unknown lives and families. Why send millions of dollars worth of water to irrigate almonds that are shipped to China, then processed, to only buy them back at a higher rate? This is a moral decision that I hope millions of dollars make your children smarter than you and make you sleep well at night.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. 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.
5295	1	Stop the tunnels leave our [explicative removed] alone.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5296	1	This would be an irreversable destruction of the environment and the place in which I live..Stop this foolish idea!	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.
5297	1	I'm signing because I am born and raised in San Joaquin County, and we need to strengthen our levees and restore and let the Delta recover from the damage caused by neglect. It needs to rejuvenate, not reroute. Our water should stay home!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Although Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A include only those habitat restoration measures needed to provide mitigation for specific regulatory compliance purposes, habitat restoration is still recognized as a critical component of the state's long-term plans for the Delta. Such larger endeavors, however, will likely be implemented over time under actions separate and apart from these alternatives. The primary parallel

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Help us save and protect our Delta!	habitat restoration program is called California EcoRestore (EcoRestore), which will be overseen by the California Resources Agency and implemented under the California Water Action Plan. Under EcoRestore, the state will pursue restoration of more than 30,000 acres of fish and wildlife habitat by 2020. These habitat restoration actions will be implemented faster and more reliably by separating them from the water conveyance facility implementation. Refer to Appendix 6A (BDCP/California WaterFix Coordination with Flood Management Requirements), Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports), and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5298	1	I want to see the decline of the California Delta ecosystem (caused by water exports to central california farms) stop.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5299	1	I hate the tunnel idea.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5300	1	I love fishing the Delta and need to protect the habitat.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need.
5301	1	The tunnels are wrong. The state is going to increase flows from the Tuolumne, Stanislaus, and Merced rivers. The excuse is for the fish, but this is nothing more than an LA water grab. Leaving the Central Valley without its water. Shame on anybody who supports this!	All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Resources Control Board on the Sacramento river with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The project considered in the EIR/EIS would not affect water operations on the Tuolumne River or water supplies for the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The State Water Resources Control Board, not DWR and Reclamation, is responsible for decisions relating to water rights. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.
5302	1	I oppose the Delta tunnels. They will harm our Delta ecosystem and will cost too much money. Fix broken water systems down south that are wasting the water we have. Don't just give them more and more water that we don't really have as they will just keep wasting it by not fixing the old outdated broken water systems.	<p>As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. The proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high to improve conditions for aquatic resources in the Delta.</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>
5303	1	The tunnels are a very bad idea. An environmental nightmare.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5304	1	I oppose the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5305	1	Colorado River, Delta Canal, California Aqueduct; now Governor Brown wants to gives them the Sacramento River, to grow almonds for China? Money grubbing.	<p>As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.</p> <p>The proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months and in drier years; and increase exports in the wet winter months in wetter years when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods.</p>
5305	2	Have not we given Southern California enough fish? For crying out loud, teach them to fish! We know they have deep canyons that fire trucks cannot access. We know they got more rain during their last storm than we got all of last year. Build dams in their domain.	<p>Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p>
5305	3	<p>My area already has little water pressure due to the celebrity backed Trinitas. I guess selling almonds to China is more lucrative than any other agriculture our own residents are making a living on.</p> <p>In a few years, we will have to import our own food.</p> <p>My own fruit and nut trees are not going to die because of your greed, matter of fact, my garden will be bigger the year because costs will be going sky high Governor Brown gets his "good ole boy" way.</p>	State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via proposed conveyance facilities.
5305	4	<p>Way to take care of the people who thought you would watch out for our rights!</p> <p>With the Stanislaus River in my back yard, yes, I see all the good money the bureaucrats have dumped into keeping salmon alive, and man you can really screw up</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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		an economic system! We really have no rights, I do not know why I even vote.	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.
5306	1	We need to update and capitalize on our existing water storage system rather than destroy the eco-system that is California's most precious resource with underground tunnels.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project and the action alternatives do 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. 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). Please see Master Response 37 that discusses approaches to increase storage in California.
5307	1	Because ! think the only "for sure" solution to California's water problems is through "Desalination plants" which can be turned on and off when needed.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
5308	1	I believe this is a really bad decision for our environment. I use the Delta and do not want to pay taxes for this!	DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.
5309	1	This is an irresponsible project that is promoting continued unsustainable use of land to keep California producing products that are inappropriate for climate. Put this money into permaculture, really be a leader in the world. Or if you choose to stay with conventional farming at least choose more appropriate crops, like hemp.	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.
5310	1	I do not believe this is the way to fix California's water issue. Leave the Delta alone. Jerry Brown and his father Pat Brown have done so much to ruin this state's water supply.	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 and the action alternatives do 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.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5310	2	Allow for sustainable and sensible farming in the central valley. Stop padding your pockets with our delta water.	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.
5311	1	I'm signing because I live in the Delta and want it to remain the fresh water haven it is - for people, fish and fowl. Please do not divert water from the Sacramento River to desert in the middle of the state!!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS.
5312	1	As a Bay Area native, I'm outraged that our governor is allowing this to occur. Tell Big Ag to find a more viable source for their water. Only when the Delta ecology is irreversibly damaged will he realize that you can't eat or drink money. This proposal is ridiculous.	<p>As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. The proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high to improve conditions for aquatic resources in the Delta.</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>
5313	1	The Delta and the San Francisco Bay estuary needs to be protected for future generations.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. For more information regarding Delta as a Place please see Master Response 24.
5314	1	I enjoy the Delta, and would like future generations to have the same opportunity.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. For more information regarding Delta as a Place please see Master Response 24.
5315	1	The tunnels are not well thought out.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5316	1	This is a critical area to be preserved. Come up with solutions that make sense, considering our environment first.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5317	1	I'm signing because there is not enough good evidence to proceed with this action.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5318	1	I strongly feel that the twin tunnels are a big mistake.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5319	1	The Delta needs our help, not more harm.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5320	1	Changing point of diversion does nothing. This will decimate our salmon populations.	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. The proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high to improve conditions for aquatic resources in the Delta.</p> <p>Effects on salmon under the proposed project and action alternatives as compared to the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative are presented in Chapter 11 of the EIR/EIS. None of the effects of Alternative 4A on salmonids were deemed significant, including mitigation. Also see responses to comments 2598-53, 2598-57, and 3013-6.</p>
5321	1	I hate having local interests meddled with by career politicians who have no interest in the betterment of the community. I support a healthy Delta ecosystem.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5322	1	I'm signing because I want to help save the Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5323	1	The ground subsidence in the Central Valley is already alarming. We do not need another boondoggle like the canal that siphons water to Southern California.	<p>The commenter is apparently referring to subsidence largely caused by overdraft of groundwater. However, this mechanism of subsidence is different than that which has caused subsidence in the Delta, which is oxidation of organic matter and other processes.</p> <p>Any subsidence caused by the conveyance facilities would tend to occur as a result of construction activities and tend to be more localized. Please refer to GEO-2 in Chapter 9 for a discussion of potential settlement caused by tunneling activities and the measures that would be implemented to avoid or minimize settlement.</p>
5324	1	I'm against it.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5325	1	I want to keep the Delta safe, and I want clean water in Northern California.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5326	1	I'm signing because out of all the things that people could be doing to help California, they decide to destroy it. We are already in a horrible drought, there are still wildfires that can start and still do. We don't have a lot of water left but with the water that we do have is home to many species of fish, crabs and other life. We can't let them do this to our home or theirs.	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.
5327	1	I'm signing this because my children live in Rio Vista and the tunnels are disrupting their hometown stop the tunnels	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
5328	1	I am from Northern California and will be back and want it to be like it was when I was there! Great fishing and hunting, leave the water were it is! They built in a desert oh well!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5329	1	This isn't the way to deal with California's water shortage. Conservation is the way!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5330	1	I was raised in the Delta and do not want to see it destroyed!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5331	1	Save our Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5332	1	I love the Delta and it has been a part of my life growing up.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
5333	1	This is a dumb idea, we can't give away water we do not have!	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 and the action alternatives do 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.
5334	1	This will devastate communities and divert wildlife from the area.	The lead agencies disagree that the project will result in the effects hypothesized by the commenter. Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect natural communities and plant and wildlife species. The chapter describes the impacts, both negative and positive, and discusses measures that would be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts and to compensate for significant impacts.
5335	1	The tunnels are crazy. They are not the answer. All it will do is ruin the fish. Like salmon for the most part. It would take years and way too much tax dollars. The gov. should be looking more at building reservoirs which would do a lot more good.	<p>While water storage is a critically important tool for managing California's water resources, it is not a topic that must be addressed in the EIR/EIS for the proposed project. This is because the proposed project does not, and need not, propose storage as a project component. Although the physical facilities contemplated by the proposed project, once up and running, would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, the proposed project is a stand-alone project for purposes of CEQA and NEPA, just as future storage projects would be. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, of the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the development of alternatives. Please see Master Response 6 for information on Demand Management.</p> <p>The commenter does not offer any evidence on how the project would result in significant impacts to salmon related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS.</p>
5336	1	Appalled at the thought of our elected officials damaging our lifestyle, environment, and farming.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5337	1	This ill conceived madness needs to be stopped. This plan produces not one more drop of water, but destroys habitat and lives.	<p>In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.</p> <p>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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).</p>
5338	1	I've worked on a Delta floating laboratory testing water samples. Every time the water gets diverted from natural flow the water quality in the Delta region declines measurably. I am against sending any more water out from its natural course.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS.
5339	1	We need the water right here at home?	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 and the action alternatives do 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.
5340	1	This does nothing to relieve the water crisis but will destroy the Delta.	<p>In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.</p> <p>Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5341	1	I don't want to see the Delta and our natural resources destroyed.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5342	1	We continue to lose our fishing rights and the Delta fish are disappearing.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.
5343	1	These tunnels will destroy our Delta environment, harm our economy and wreck the ecology system we all depend on.	The issue raised 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.
5344	1	It would be a travesty to destroy the Delta in this manner.	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.
5345	1	I'm opposed to the twin tunnel concept to much money to benefit a few and we need more storage	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5346	1	I have been enjoying the Delta for 41 years. The wildlife and farming benefits should be enough reason to save the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5347	1	I'm singing because I live in the Central Valley as well as work in agriculture, why is it that we have to give up our water while LA isn't on any water restriction programs?!	<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 and the action alternatives do 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.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).</p>
5348	1	Mega projects such as the tunnels are not the solution to California's water woes and is likely to create worse environmental problems than it appears to solve.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5349	1	I don't want the Delta damaged by the intrusion of more salt water from the bay. It is a naturally made eco-system that should be protected and not raped!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS.
5350	1	I live in the Delta and this "plan" will cause significant salt water intrusion into my immediate area and will ruin the water supply for my home, and for thousands just like me.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
5351	1	It ridiculous to do the underwater tunnel! LA can build a desalination plant already!	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
5352	1	The tunnels will destroy the delta. Spend the money on restoring levees and fixing what we already have.	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.
5353	1	Because I don't want Jerry's tunnels to dry or turn the Delta into a brackish water shed with less water flow affecting the farmers and wildlife.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS.
5354	1	The people and wildlife need to preserve what little part of the Delta that remains rather than costly and short sighted water transfers.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5355	1	Stop the tunnels. This is not good for the San Francisco Bay-Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5356	1	The unintended and unforeseen consequences of such a massive project may not be realized until generations have passed and then it will be too late. Consider Mono Lake or the Florida Everglades. In the long run, humans cannot outsmart nature.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5357	1	We are tired of being robbed of our natural delta. Leave it alone to thrive on it's own. Stupid people.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5358	1	This is a stupid plan that ignores the underlying causes of the drought. Namely the industrial growth society killing the planet through climate change.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
5359	1	I love the Delta and this would change it in a way that we will regret.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5360	1	Please do not go through with these tunnels. When it is so obvious as to the damage these tunnels would create, why?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			operational flexibility.
5361	1	The old peripheral canal - rearing its ugly head! Stop! (Isn't the Central Valley sinking due to water greed?)	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 36 (Peripheral Canal).
5362	1	I want to keep the balance in the central California ecosystem.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5363	1	We need better sustainable ways to provide water to farmers without devastating the ecology of the Delta. We need to stop wasting water and stop polluting water with animal waste and chemicals. No tunnels please.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS.
5364	1	I want the Delta to be the way it was, and use the waterways!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5365	1	California is my home. And my family's home. And home to all of the flora and fauna I grew up with and care deeply about. I don't want to be the last generation to know California as a beautiful home. I have worked in agriculture, communities, and sustainability for 10+ years, and I cannot support the costs, logic, or risks of this plan.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. For more information regarding costs please see Master Response 5.
5366	1	Tunnels are not the way to fix California's drought and sustainable water problems. Don't do it!	<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 and the action alternatives do 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.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).</p>
5367	1	You can't ship water down a tunnel when the lake that holds it is dry. We need more reservoirs not tunnels.	<p>Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5368	1	This is not going to help the environment.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5368	2	We also need to stop fracking!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
5369	1	I'm signing because we need to protect the natural environments that we depend on. Farming in California needs to adapt or move! Farmers can not drain the rivers dry! I come from a farming community in Nicolaus. I realize that climate change is going to have major effects on agriculture and we need to plan for 7 generations into the future. Our shortsightedness is what has gotten us into this mess! (along with greed for money and power) As the climate changes we need to prepare for extreme weather events and fund research into better alternatives to soil farming.	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.
5370	1	Please invest in water conservation efforts over destroying such a beautiful well loved place.	<p>Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p>
5371	1	I oppose the Delta tunnels. Not a good idea, hurts the Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5372	1	We "need" fish just as we "need" water to drink. Don't destroy one species to profit another!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5373	1	I think the twin tunnel plan will be a huge expense to our environment and our budget. We don't need to destroy the Delta ecosystem to send water to southern CA. Let's conserve what we have and let innovators develop new ways to desalinate our abundant sea water that will be rising with climate change.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. For more information regarding demand management please see Master Response 6.
5374	1	It makes no sense to just move water around. We should be planning for water storage. So. Cal has gotten a lot of water lately but there are no storage areas. Build dams instead.	<p>Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.
5375	1	I do not support the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5376	1	The tunnels will kill the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5377	1	The Delta is the greatest bass fishery in the U.S. and the tunnels will ruin it.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.
5378	1	The river and our Delta will be ruined by these tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5379	1	I believe what the Governor is doing is wrong for so many already stated obvious reasons and is refusing to try any alternative possibilities.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5380	1	I do not want tunnels to be built around/under the Delta! It will destroy the entire ecosystem. It is a terrible idea and a waste of money! No!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5381	1	Don't take the beautiful California Delta from the people who love it, nor the egrets, the Great Blue Heron, the otters, the Striper, the Large and Small Mouth Bass, the catfish, the salmon and more. We are tired of losing our water supply to supply water to areas of California that are desert, and should never be built upon in the first place. Don't take away our Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5382	1	I've lived next to the Delta all my life. When I was a child we were fighting the taking all of our water to send to L.A., and killing off our wildlife. Let L.A. get its own water. Don't kill our Delta.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26. 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
5383	1	I am signing [the petition] because this is an environmental disaster in the making, and I'm also concerned about the impact this would have on the economy in this region. I am opposed to these Delta Tunnels!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Chapter 16 (Socioeconomics) of the EIR/EIS for information on impacts to socioeconomics and mitigation for these impacts.
5384	1	This is a ridiculous plan, that's why.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5385	1	I grew up on the Delta and have seen its decline for decades. I'm sad to see our leadership further destroying our great Delta system.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5386	1	My family has a thriving business in the Delta and the Tunnels would kill that. The loss of a lifelong recreation industry would be decimated and those elders who rely on the earnings would suffer undo hardships.	Please refer to Chapter 15, Recreation, and to Impacts ECON-1, 5, and 17 regarding recreation-related impacts, and to Table 15-15 regarding the specific recreational facilities that would be affected by the preferred alternative.
5387	1	Oppose exporting nut when in a drought! We need to protect the water we have.	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.
5388	1	I have watched the organizations and our government over the years destroy our state fisheries and propagate the farmlands of the south that really are desert regions. When will it stop. We do not have unlimited resources or water. Northern California needs what we have left. Stop the tunnels, it's just water grab conduit for the people that want to make money. Large farms. Stop the tunnels nonsense, it's just an underground canal that we voted on and stopped once before.	<p>In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.</p> <p>Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p>
5389	1	This is a very bad idea.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5390	1	Preserve the Delta habitat.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5391	1	Preserve our San Francisco Bay-Delta region ecology and economy!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5392	1	I would hate to see the Delta destroyed and the wild life lost.	The lead agencies disagree that the project will result in the effects hypothesized by the commenter. Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect natural communities and plant and wildlife species. The chapter describes the impacts, both negative and positive, and discusses

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			measures that would be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts and to compensate for significant impacts.
5393	1	I am signing [the petition] because I believe that the water belongs to the California Delta residents, and is not to farmers who will take our water to grow their farms for export purposes.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.
5394	1	I'm signing [the petition] because I want to save our water source, and to preserve our water for the animals habitat. We don't want to endanger the animals living and depending on the Delta water.	<p>In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.</p> <p>Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p>
5395	1	I want to preserve our water and environment as well as the people's lives who depend on the Delta.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5396	1	Need to save the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5397	1	I am signing because the National Academy of Sciences has already stated that the Delta water supply is overdrawn for the health of the Delta.	As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			the river flows are high to improve conditions for aquatic resources in the Delta. As shown in Appendix 5A, Section C, Delta outflow would be similar under the proposed project as compared to the No Action Alternative.
5397	2	The Sacramento Delta is the largest estuary in Borth and South America on the West Coast and the largest estuary in the United States west of the Mississippi. It is the foundation of life--equalivent to Mesopotamia or the Amazon--for species habitat. The Delta must be protected.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5397	3	The Greater Bay Area threw away over a trillion gallons of treated wastewater last year, which could have been recycled and reused for Agriculture. The shortfall in the Central Valley was 2.1 trillion, according to UC Davis. This "new" water should be pumped to locations where farmers can use it. Recycled water is high in nitrogen and phosphorus and is neutral pH, so it is better for Ag than potable or raw water.	Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.
5397	4	The Delta tunnels are predicted to damage the economies of the 5 surrounding counties, creating negative economic effects.	Under Alternative 4A, additional regional employment and income could create net positive effects on the character of Delta communities. 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. Please refer to Master Response 5 regarding costs of implementation and funding for the BDCP. Please also refer to Master Response 3, Purpose and Need.
5398	1	I am signing this petition because I believe that pumping all of our Delta water down south will destroy fragile ecosystem.	By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The proposed project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports). 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.
5399	1	It is foolish to deplete the Delta water, to subsidize the even more desert south. We need to develop programs for conservation/reuse and learn to live in the semi-arid land California is.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5400	1	The Delta ecosystem needs to be protected and restored. Stop the tunnels.	A primary goal of the BDCP would be to restore wetlands and protect Delta habitats. However, please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A. The preferred alternative includes AMMs for reducing impacts and mitigation measures compensating for significant impacts on wetlands and habitats, but wetland restoration would take place under a separate program, California EcoRestore. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Chapter 11 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses measures to protect aquatic ecosystem, and Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses measures to protect terrestrial ecosystems.
5401	1	This is a stupid idea!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5402	1	There are more efficient ways to come up with water supply for California and affecting the ecosystem of thousands of water life in the Delta is not the smartest way to go. It is the least effective and "easy way out" decision for California to do. Put your brains together and figure out game plans that will help not only California but other states that go into droughts in the future years. Instead of tunneling from the Delta, build tunnels that connect the west coast to the east coast and use their rainfall that goes to waste!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5403	1	The proposed tunnels are insane.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5404	1	I am against the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5405	1	The Delta is far too important to our lives and environment to let it get destroyed.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5406	1	The tunnels will harm the fish and increase the salinization of the Delta farm land.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 5 (Conservation Measures 1 as a CM) and Master Response 14 (Salinity).
5407	1	I oppose the Delta Tunnels! They will destroy the Delta and waste taxpayer money that could be better spent on other projects. The state can't even control the water hyacinths in Delta waterways. How are they going to handle maintenance on underground tunnels?	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 5 for information on cost and funding.
5408	1	The tunnels idea is dumb science, just like forced vaccination.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5409	1	This is insane, to divert our water and destroy the Delta and our fishery.	<p>In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Deliveries to in-Delta senior water rights users are the same under the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and all action alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS in accordance with existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.</p> <p>Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. The Proposed Project would improve conditions for aquatic resources by decreasing total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increasing exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high.</p>
5410	1	[We] need the normal Delta freshwater flushing. No water deviation south.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS.
5411	1	We must protect our environment.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5412	1	The Delta is a magnificent, special place, and the tunnels and more exportation of water to Southern California will be devastating to this environment.	<p>Since the late 1800s, the Bay-Delta ecosystem has been substantially altered. Changes in key environmental attributes of the Bay-Delta have contributed to the current degraded state of the ecosystem and appear to be proximate causes of declines in desired fishes and increases in non-native species. California WaterFix is not intended to address all the factors that have contributed to the Delta's decline and briefly summarizes a few but not all of those factors. Many factors that have contributed to the decline of the Delta's ecosystem including the conversion of tidal marsh and floodplains to farmland, construction of levees and altering of tide flows, in-Delta and upstream water diversions, contaminant discharges, ammonia and nutrient discharges and changes to the food web, increases in water temperatures, and introduction of non-native and invasive species. The Delta will remain in a highly altered state for the foreseeable future and the project is not intended to address all the past harms or restore the Delta to a pre-altered state.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations.</p> <p>It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented California WaterFix project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Please see Master Response 26 for additional information on effects on northern California. Please also refer to Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5413	1	What is left of the Delta needs to be conserved.	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.
5414	1	I support and will defend nature. We cannot continue our trend of permanently destroying nature to fix a temporary problem.	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.
5415	1	The "son of the peripheral canal" tunnels will claim water needed for fish, wildlife, and the health of San Francisco Bay and send it to irrigate water-hungry export crops in the San Joaquin Valley.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</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. 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>
5416	1	I love the Delta and want to help it, for everyone.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5417	1	This project is too expensive and not needed. Will destroy the environment.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5418	1	I grew up on the Delta and don't want it destroyed.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
5419	1	Protect our waterways for today and our children's tomorrow.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5420	1	California WaterFix is not the answer to the water issues in the state.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5421	1	I love life in all its glorious forms and this project would be disastrous for all remaining life in the formerly fecund Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5422	1	This [WaterFix project] will destroy our state.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5423	1	This [WaterFix project] is stupid. There is no more water. There are no water saving projects for [the] past 30 years. We built catchment basins to prevent flood damage only.	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).</p>
5424	1	I oppose the Delta tunnels and believe in saving the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5425	1	The Delta has a very sensitive ecosystem. Please stop pumping our water out of the Delta.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5426	1	The Delta tunnels will ruin fishing, farming in the Delta, Delta communities, and San Francisco Bay Area wildlife.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Resource areas are addressed separately under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible. Refer to Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5427	1	The tunnels are a bad idea.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5428	1	I love the Delta and all the natural beauty that exists here.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5429	1	Even though I now live in Iowa, the Delta will always be my home. It is a truly unique place. The tunnels would destroy one of the most beautiful places on Earth.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5430	1	I'm a concerned citizen [who] uses the Delta for recreation with my family and also to	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		tournament fish, and [we] fishermen spend millions of dollars in the communities around the Delta.	need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: “Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities” would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: “Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities” would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.
5431	1	Big money grab at our expense! No!	<p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR’s fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 45 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
5432	1	This project would ruin the Delta and all of the associated industrial work that relies on it.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).
5433	1	Moving what little water sustains the Bay and Delta is not a fix. It creates no new water. It only diverts water to areas that should be conserving their own groundwater. There should be plans to build dams where water could collect once we have rain. Or desalination plants could be built to provide fresh water to Southern California at Southern California’s expense.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. For information regarding why water storage was not included in the proposed project, refer to Master Response 37 (Water Storage) and Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need. Additionally, please refer to Master Response 7 for information on desalination and why it was not included as a project alternative.
5434	1	I sincerely believe that removing fresh water from the Delta will turn it into a salt marsh and ruin the farmland and wildlife habitat.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS.
5435	1	The Delta is one of my favorite places to ride motorcycles. The Delta tunnels will drastically alter the landscape and beauty of the area.	Please refer to Chapter 17 regarding aesthetics and visual impacts and Chapter 15 regarding recreation impacts.
5436	1	I care about our Delta waters and our California fisheries. I oppose [WaterFix]! Please save our 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. Resource areas are addressed separately under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible.
5437	1	This is not good for the Delta [or] the environment, and most of all, it is a waste of	DWR’s fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		taxpayer money -- instead of spending the money on a permanent solution to fix our water problem.	<p>the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p>
5438	1	Jerry Brown is an idiot and I actually care about California's water issues, not just bribe money.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5439	1	I'm concerned about our Delta and the negative impact on the Bay Area.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5440	1	I believe this Delta Tunnel deal is one of the worst ideas in the history of California!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5441	1	I love the fishery that the Delta provides!	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.
5442	1	I am against our water going to Southern California so they can wash their cars, fill their pools, and waste water that we need here for our farmers.	<p>In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).</p>
5443	1	Don't destroy the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5444	1	We cannot send more water south! We need the water we have left.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environment impacts in the EIR/S were raised.
5445	1	Tunnels are not the solution. We should restore the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5446	1	The Delta's natural water flows should not be diverted around the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5447	1	The Delta is a great wetland [that] needs protection, not to be drained for profit.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5448	1	We must protect our current Delta 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.
5449	1	Besides its importance as an estuary, the Delta has a vital -- and fragile -- human ecology of ranchers, farmers, artists, scientists and good souls who have lived on the land for generations. Don't drain the Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports).
5450	1	Too much climate and environmental change/damage; too much wildlife dying; Southern California needs to pay for desalinization plants to make the Pacific Ocean their water supply, or move north to where the water is instead of taking the water away from its normal path.and ruining the ecosystem [and] Northern/Central Valley farm enterprises.	<p>It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 (Demand Management) for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Although desalination is already a part of California's overall water portfolio and will surely become a bigger part with the passage of time, the technology will not be capable within any kind of foreseeable timeframe to produce amounts of usable water comparable to those associated with the alternatives included in the BDCP/California WaterFix EIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 7 for additional information regarding desalination.</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>
5451	1	We need to protect our environment.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5452	1	The Delta Tunnels is a horrific plan. Jerry couldn't get his peripheral canal during his first legal terms as governor and now has tried to trick us into his peripheral canal/Delta tunnel project. Makes me wonder what is in it for him for this to go through -- certainly that benefits California residents! Besides, when we suffer droughts, what water is there to send to Los Angeles?	A number of important improvements have been made to set the current proposal apart from the Peripheral Canal. For instance, tunnels are proposed to reduce surface impacts associated with canals. The capacity of the Proposed Project is more than 10,000 cfs smaller than the Peripheral Canal. The project as proposed allows for dual conveyance allowing through-Delta operations to continue in order to maintain in-Delta water quality. The Proposed Project would require operation of the proposed new in-Delta portions of the CVP and SWP pursuant to environmentally stringent rules under the Federal Endangered Species Act and California Endangered Species Act. Refer to Master Response 36 (Peripheral Canal).

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5453	1	I oppose the tunnel project.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5454	1	The natural ecosystem and Mother Earth need to come before the profit of greedy capitalists. Period.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5455	1	[The WaterFix] is impossible, impractical and life-threatening.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5456	1	I am concerned that we are sacrificing one group's water and livelihood for another's. Please look again at the research and reconsider.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5457	1	I live on the Delta. The twin tunnels [are] the worst option for the Delta and California. No tunnels.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5458	1	I've seen the decline in the Delta -- nothing is being done to save and restore it. Brown is just waiting for it to fail during the next big water year so he can say see we need the tunnels. You can fool the fools, Brown; I see what [you are] doing.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5459	1	The tunnels are a waste of [money] and don't fix the problem.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5460	1	The tunnels have not been proven to solve the problem of getting water to other areas without sacrificing the Delta region itself. You can't help [one] area while destroying another! It just doesn't make sense.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5461	1	The Central Valley is already suffering due to the way water is channeled.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5462	1	Stop the tunnels!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5463	1	I promote sustainable California.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5464	1	I'm from the valley -- this is a reactionary endeavor.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5465	1	I strongly oppose this plan that would devastate our local ecology!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5466	1	Our water belongs [to] us. Northern California needs [to] be better protected [for] a sustainable future.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5467	1	We should continue water cutbacks at home and business. More cutbacks on irrigation for landscaping.	Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p>
5468	1	I've been following this and the work of former San Joaquin County CAO [County Administrative Officer] Manuel Lopez's efforts to prevent this very thing from happening! It's maddening that people would blindly follow this plan without understanding how it will cripple our valley!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5469	1	The Delta is an important region and is necessary for ecological and biological balance in California.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5470	1	My community in Stockton, California would be affected by the construction of these tunnels. With California's highly resourceful government I believe this state could find an alternate solution.	The commenter does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS.
5471	1	We need to conserve the water we have and explore other options.	<p>Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
5472	1	Keep the water where it's supposed to be. Let Mother Earth choose its course. Stop using so much water [for] factory farm animals and then there might be enough left for all of us to use.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5473	1	I believe diverting huge amounts of water through the tunnels will be very damaging to the ecology of the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5474	1	I farm ground in the islands and am worried about saltwater intrusion.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5475	1	I've grown up and lived [in] an area of the Delta and have many close friends and families that live up and down the Sacramento Delta areas. I am shocked that this legislation is even on the table. I don't see an upside except profitability to the agricultural industry in those areas south of us that could use more water to sell more of their almonds, etc. The effects to the wildlife alone are devastating should the California WaterFix be approved. I strongly oppose the Delta tunnels plan per the California WaterFix (Alternative 4A).	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. It is not the result of "favoring" large corporations (e.g., large agribusinesses). In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Change in Delta Exports), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply). See Chapter 12 (Terrestrial Resources) of the EIR/EIS for information on the impacts of the project to wildlife species and mitigation for these impacts.
5476	1	The tunnels do not increase water or even capture and store upstream water. [They] certainly will lead to the destruction of the Delta.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5477	1	The tunnels are not the answer.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5478	1	I don't think [it] is right to send the water to Southern California.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5479	1	This is part of me. This is home. Building the tunnels will ruin that for me and many others.	The issue raised 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 project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5480	1	The Delta Tunnels are a disgrace to the natural environment of California. The Delta consists of over 1,000 miles of navigable waterways, used mostly for farming and recreational activities year-round. The Delta Tunnels will, without a doubt, effectively destroy this thriving estuary. For those of us [who] love the Delta, it's unimaginable a Delta that would be anything but fresh water, let alone the devastating effect the tunnels will have on fifth-generation Delta farmers.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation).
5481	1	Due to water shortages I feel that the Governor has no right to start such an expensive project and feel that Southern California has no right to our water. I would recommend that our liberal Governor consider having Southern California build and pay for desalination plants off the Los Angeles shoreline and they can pay for and get all that water from the ocean rather from our fragile Delta.	<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.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			proposed project and Master Response 7 regarding desalination.
5482	1	I love the Delta. This is the dumbest idea ever. Build a desalination plant!	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
5483	1	Ruin the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5484	1	I do not want to send the valley's water to Southern California. I enjoy 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.
5485	1	The state needs to build reservoirs for the entire state to provide water supply for all areas and needs. To allow water to run into the ocean without any way to capture it makes no sense.	<p>Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p>
5485	2	Digging tunnels through the earthquake faults and taking water from the sensitive Delta area when our area needs water as well to maintain our cities and farming.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports).
5486	1	The tunnels will ruin the Delta. And this should never happen.	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.
5487	1	We shouldn't be stripping established water rights and ruining our resources and environments to supply industry with up to 40 percent wasted resources in a place it does not belong. They dump nearly 40 percent of the crops they grow with precious water in the Central Valley.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The issue of agricultural and industrial 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.
5488	1	My family [and] I use the Delta water ways at least 200 days per year for fishing [and] hunting. Also the quality of the Delta would be in danger if more water restrictions are imposed. We already do not have good flow of tides because of the Delta aqueduct	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		that is sending water to the south end of California.	years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports).
5489	1	Water is a natural resource and should not be bought or sold as a commodity. The real issue is recycling water, water storage and asking the Southern Californians to stop buying water and invest in desalinization units.	<p>It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Although desalination is already a part of California's overall water portfolio and will surely become a bigger part with the passage of time, the technology will not be capable within any kind of foreseeable timeframe to produce amounts of usable water comparable to those associated with the alternatives included in the BDCP/California WaterFix EIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 7 for additional information regarding desalination.</p> <p>Additional water storage was eliminated from consideration in the BDCP EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS through the alternatives development and screening process (discussed below and in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives). As such, the proposed project does not propose storage as a project component. Although the proposed project would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, Alternative 4A is a stand-alone project which demonstrates independent utility just as future storage projects would demonstrate. Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives) and Master Response 37 (Storage) for additional information.</p>
5489	2	Who is going to save our foundations and houses here in Northern California because our water tables are shrinking? According to the U.S. Geological Survey this is the worst drought for California in 1,200 years. Hmmm! Sounds like someone is trying to turn a profit out of a disaster.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5490	1	I'm signing because I have lived on the Delta my entire life it is a beautiful ecosystem that is delicate and beautiful and you will destroy it with these useless tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5490	2	Who is paying you off, Governor Brown, to do this to Northern California? This will not fix the water problem! Let Southern California buy water from other states if they need more water. Taking it from us is wrong! You will destroy Northern California!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5491	1	I grew up in San Joaquin County and know the value and need for water to remain there.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environment impacts in the EIR/S were raised.
5492	1	The Delta and San Joaquin Valley need the water, so don't send it south.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5493	1	What Governor Brown has planned is not a solution.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5494	1	The tunnel is just wrong!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5495	1	The twin tunnels [are] giving all our water to the south. We need it for the valley and the farmland and the rivers.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports).
5496	1	The tunnels are a bad idea.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5497	1	I do not agree with taking water from our Delta to send it down south! Just build a plant to make salt water into fresh water offshore and leave our Delta alone.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
5498	1	Natural waterways should not be disturbed.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5499	1	I'm a Delta born and grown river rat and don't want to see more problems in our waterways like the mitten crabs caused.	The commenter does not offer any evidence on how the project would result in significant aquatic impacts related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5500	1	I want to save the Delta. Stop the tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5501	1	Save the Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5502	1	I love to fish and this would kill the habitat.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.
5503	1	I'm signing because my family owns property on the Delta and [has] for generations. The tunnels would ruin their farming and livelihood. It's not right to take what isn't yours. Maybe someday our government will learn that notion and concentrate on fixing our economy, crime and corruption in the system.	<p>Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.</p> <p>As described in Impact ECON-6 under Alternative 4A in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, construction of conveyance facilities would convert land from existing agricultural uses to project-related construction uses, and agricultural land could also be affected by changes in water quality and other conditions that would affect crop productivity. These direct effects on agricultural land are described under Impacts AG-1 and AG-2 in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources. Total value of irrigated crop production in the Delta would decline on average by \$5.3 million per year during the construction period, with total irrigated crop acreage declining by about 4,700 acres. Other effects related to production costs, travel time, and loss of investments in production facilities and standing orchards and vineyards would also occur as a result of facilities construction. When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the alternative. When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the alternative.</p>
5504	1	The plan is faulty. Rewrite the EIRs and step back [and] rework!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5505	1	It will affect my family's business, our livelihood and our children's future! Don't give away what we need to survive!	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. For more information regarding impacts to socioeconomics please see Chapter 16 of the FEIR/EIS.
5506	1	I believe the better answer is building more storage facilities, especially in Southern California where all the rain they get goes down the concrete channel that used to be	Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		the Los Angeles River and out to sea.	<p>in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p>
5507	1	I love the Delta, I love my home. This will be deadly.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
5508	1	The Delta region is already struggling in terms of ecology and salinity. This project would devastate this very unique region.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
5509	1	The Delta is a resource that is something special. Efforts should be made to preserve the waterways for the local communities they support and funds should be spent to better protect its barriers [and] levee roads.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5510	1	I oppose the Delta tunnels. Building these tunnels will further deteriorate the ecosystem.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5511	1	I believe there can be another solution to the water issue without depriving one part of the state to supply the other. Consider desalination.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
5512	1	I want to preserve our Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5513	1	As a lifelong California resident I do not want to see further encroachment on the natural Delta watershed.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5514	1	I want the Delta left the hell alone.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5515	1	The tunnels will not provide more water and will destroy an already fragile ecology in the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5516	1	I don't want the Delta damaged with the rape planned by the tunnels to this pristine area. Desalination plants in the ocean are the way to go!	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5517	1	We do not need the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5518	1	I fish for salmon, steelhead and striped bass in the Delta and want to make sure we do what we can to preserve the Delta and its wildlife so that my kids and grandkids can enjoy the Delta as I have. We can do more to protect this fragile ecosystem on which so much depends. I can't see how taking more water will make things better. In my lifetime I have watched the fisheries collapse to the point they are at now, which is a sad thing indeed.	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p> <p>Chapter 11 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect fish. It describes the impacts, both negative and positive, and discusses measures that would be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts and to compensate for significant impacts. Refer to Master Response 5.</p>
5519	1	There are so many better options that would cost less and actually provide additional water for California, and improve the Delta levees.	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.
5520	1	I do not agree with the building of underground tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5521	1	There are better alternatives to the tunnels.	Please refer to Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives.
5522	1	I am signing because my life depends on the California water project being defeated. I get all my water from the Delta, to live and grow food.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project and Master Response 26 regarding changes in Delta exports.
5523	1	The tunnels will do nothing for drought relief. Will only benefit and is solely designed for small number of wealthy water grabbers at our expense and [to] the detriment of our fisheries.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports).
5524	1	The plan to steal the water from Northern California has been opposed multiple times, due to the devastation it will cause to the fragile Delta ecosystem and the billions of dollars that will be lost from farming, water recreation and marinas, restaurants, tourism and jobs! This must be stopped at all costs. Destroying the Delta will completely destroy the Stockton economy! Sign this petition now and stop Jerry Brown and this initiative at all costs!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports). Refer to Chapter 16 (Socioeconomics) of the EIR/EIS for information on socioeconomic impacts of the project and mitigation for these impacts.
5525	1	It's pretty simple -- think of the ecosystem!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5526	1	The Delta waters are not only an ecological blessing, but also a fun playground for me and my family. Destroying this sensitive area in order to fulfill your costly campaign	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		promises is both ethically irresponsible and generally negligent as a steward of the earth. This is all about money and power with very little regard for the resources, both living and fluid. This is going to destroy the balance of nature and line the already deep pockets of those who don't have enough sense to realize that building a farm in the desert is just plain dumb.	Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5527	1	California WaterFix is a big lie!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5528	1	The Delta is all we have left in the valley. How dare our criminal politicians do this to our children's waterways . . . how dare them!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5529	1	The Delta is an important waterway in sustaining our local farms. I don't want to see the habitat change for the fish and wildlife.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5530	1	I am one of many owners who have farm land and who grew up on the Delta waterways. The tunnels will directly impact my family's farming along with our water rights. Please stop the tunnels.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. When required, the project proponents would provide compensation to property owners for losses due to implementation of the alternative. The State Water Resources Control Board, not DWR, is responsible for decisions relating to water rights. DWR holds water rights approved by the State Water Resources Control Board but does not have the power or authority to issue water rights to others. Additionally, the proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor include any regulatory actions that would affect water rights holders other than DWR, Reclamation, and SWP and CVP contractors. Importantly, all water exported by the SWP and CVP is the subject of the existing water rights of those two agencies. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives analyzed in the EIR/EIS only include the use of water from existing SWP and CVP water rights or voluntary water transfers from other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders.
5531	1	We need the Delta to remain as it is rather than being devastated to fatten the wallets of corporate agriculture.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5532	1	I would hate to see the Delta be drained out just so it can be sent elsewhere.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5533	1	This project is evil, corrupt and money laundering. Taking from taxpayers who don't want or approve it to give to Jerry Brown's cronies. Follow the money. We will be devastated forever	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5534	1	You can't rob this ecosystem for the use of the wealthy. How about a real solution? Pipeline from the mighty Mississippi. Get on board and benefit from that water source that isn't even close to drying up.	Shipping water from the Mississippi to California is beyond the scope of the California WaterFix or the BDCP. Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.
5535	1	This is a crucial issue for the future health of the Delta and the San Francisco Bay estuary.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5536	1	I opposed the peripheral canal and I oppose the peripheral tunnels. The will most definitely harm drinking water quality in the San Francisco Bay Area and cause irreparable damage to the Delta.	Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the EIR/EIS discloses the potential water quality impacts resulting from constructing and operating the proposed project. See also Master Response 14 (Water Quality).
5537	1	Restore our Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5538	1	We are in just as much need as them.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5539	1	I do not want the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5540	1	I oppose the tunnels. Stop giving our water away. Who will give us water when we have none left?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5541	1	I know the negative outcome this will have.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5542	1	Save the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5543	1	The tunnels will cause more damage than good.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5544	1	We need to stand together and stop this, and by signing this petition I hope we will be able to stop this. No tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5545	1	I don't want the Delta to disappear.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5546	1	We need to preserve our waterways and the wildlife that depends on [them].	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.
5547	1	I believe that what they are doing is wrong and unethical.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5548	1	We need to protect our Delta waterways and the species that exist in [them].	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5549	1	No tunnel in the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5550	1	Taking more water from the Delta is a crime. No scientific or engineering study produced by Governor Brown is valid over the will of the people in this area.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5551	1	This will destroy the Northern California waterways and ecosystem completely, solely for the profit of a few.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
5552	1	I have always been against the tunnels, from the beginning.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5553	1	I want to protect the Delta and the Bay. What part of having a great white shark in the Bay don't you get?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5554	1	Leave our waterways alone! No pipes, no tunnels!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5555	1	Not only is this a very important local issue, but this is part of a larger environmental issue. We need to stop destroying the remaining natural ecosystems in this country and on this planet. California should be a leader on this issue, not a part of the problem.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5556	1	This is a huge misuse of public funds in which a resource is taken from one group of people and given to another.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project, Master Response 44 regarding changes in Delta exports, and Master Response 38 regarding costs and implementation.
5557	1	The loss of water would drastically change the Delta farming industries around my region and the thought of watching something as spectacular as the Delta slowly disappear seems disastrous.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. See Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports) and Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).
5558	1	Leave the Delta alone. There needs to be another solution.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5559	1	The Bay-Delta tunnels will ruin one of the last estuaries in California and the U.S., home to thousands of endangered and dying bird species.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5560	1	There is something incongruent when the San Francisco Chronicle one day reports on the joy for restoration of wetlands in the North Bay and on another day reports on the mechanics of the harebrained scheme of constructing two tunnels that will destroy the ecological balance of the Delta.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5561	1	The \$60 billion spent for this debacle will not create any additional water. Show me any river that has been improved by siphoning water out and sending it to interests who want to farm the desert for personal profit!	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. 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).
5562	1	I know this is a terrible idea based on all the research done from various sources, who all say the same thing -- this is a very bad idea. Except the people lining your pockets, Mr. Brown. They think it is a great idea. Corrupt is what you are, Governor Brown. Were before and still now.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5563	1	I'm from the San Joaquin Valley, I love our precious Delta and having worked with many scientists in the Delta on aquatic weed eradication, I know these tunnels would destroy this delicate and unique habitat. The water is already so low. I see river otter roadkill because the water is too saline and they jump out to escape. I see yellow patches in farming fields because the salinity is too high and killing the land. These tunnels are the worst kind of solution, not well thought through and backed by wealthy people with swimming pools to fill down south!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS.
5564	1	Opposition of the tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5565	1	I believe in the Delta, in having natural water ways and having a sustainable environment. What is ours, our communities, shouldn't be taken away and destroyed	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		-- it should be embraced and cherished!	
5566	1	Stop draining Northern California.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5567	1	The Delta is our way of life. Diverting water will drastically change the way we live.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need). The proposed project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports). 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.
5568	1	It was bad enough to propose tunnels to deprive the ecologically essential Delta of freshwater, but now to cut back on how much acreage would be restored is a real slap in the face but wasteful chemical agribusiness in the western San Joaquin Valley.	The California WaterFix (Alternative 4A) presented in the EIR/EIS proposes habitat restoration, enhancement and protection and other actions (described as Environmental Commitments) that would reduce the effects of constructing and operating the proposed water conveyance facilities. These actions would fully reduce these impacts. The State has also committed to restore up to 30,000 acres of Delta habitat under the California EcoRestore program, which is separate from the proposed project. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5569	1	I support the Delta as a special area plus a very productive farm area. Moving water to another part of the valley merely ruins a different farming and fishing area.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports).
5570	1	I want to save the salmon.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5571	1	I don't want to waste billions of dollars on a project that will devastate the San Francisco Bay-Sacramento River Estuary without increasing the state's water supply.	As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 5.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5572	1	Pumping has already caused major damage to the Delta system over the years. These tunnels will be the nail in the coffin!	The commenter does not offer any evidence on how the project would result in significant impacts that they cite.
5573	1	I worked with Jerry Waldie to stop the diversion of the Delta in the '60s and '70s. Stop the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5574	1	I believe in the importance of the Delta waters and fish and birds.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5575	1	We really don't need this.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5576	1	This will literally destroy the Delta ecosystem. It's a total waste of taxpayer \$\$\$\$	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 5.
5577	1	I'm signing this petition because our Delta recedes more every year and I've watched it the salt water go further inland over the past 35 years.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS.
5578	1	The Delta should be protected and left alone.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5579	1	I live and work on the delta and the tunnels make no sense.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
5580	1	Tunnels do not make water. This is just a multi-billion dollar boondoggle designed to fleece taxpayers out of billions.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. 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).
5580	2	Build water desalinization plants with that money and you will actually make water. Build those tunnels and you will destroy the Delta, wildlife, jobs, and the local economy.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
5581	1	I am signing because I am opposed to the Delta Tunnels and the environmental impact that it will have on the Delta, its' wildlife, and the agricultural land surrounding	The issue raised 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		the area.	environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Resource areas are addressed in the EIR/EIS separately under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible.
5582	1	Just like all previous projects to ship one of our most precious resources to Southern California, this is a terrible idea. It's bad economics! It's bad environmentally. And it's bad for public health! I urge you to oppose this wrong headed plan. Thank you!	All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Resources Control Board on the Sacramento river with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The project considered in the EIR/EIS would not affect water operations on the Tuolumne River or water supplies for the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The State Water Resources Control Board, not DWR and Reclamation, is responsible for decisions relating to water rights. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26. Considerations of adverse impacts to Delta water users due to implementation of the action alternatives (not climate change, sea level rise, or projected population growth that would have occurred with or without the proposed project) are discussed in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, and Chapter 20, Public Services and Utilities. Changes in Delta water quality that could affect Delta water users are discussed in Chapter 8, Water Quality, including changes in bromide, chloride, and electrical conductivity. Changes in socioeconomics under the proposed project and other action alternatives as compared to the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative are presented in Chapter 16 of the EIR/EIS.
5583	1	This does not solve anything but creates more problems. Sit down, re-thinkis this the kind of legacy the Brown admin wants to leave behind?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5584	1	Storage and desalination are the answer.	While water storage is a critically important tool for managing California's water resources, it is not a topic that must be addressed in the EIR/EIS for the proposed project. This is because the proposed project does not, and need not, propose storage as a project component. Although the physical facilities contemplated by the proposed project, once up and running, would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, the proposed project is a stand-alone project for purposes of CEQA and NEPA, just as future storage projects would be. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, of the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the development of alternatives. Please see Master Response 6 for information on Demand Management. For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
5585	1	Instead of destroying the lovely Delta estuary, build reservoirs in central and southern California. Then they won't need to drain northern California dry.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Operation of the new north Delta facilities will be guided by strict regulations that are set by the SWRCB. Adaptive management and collaborative science will aid operators in managing the pumping schedule in the presence of sensitive species. Appendix B of the RDEIR/SDEIS shows supplemental modeling results for the new alternatives. In particular Section B.2.1 Alternative 4A the modeling demonstrates that under the preferred alternative (4A) reservoir levels (e.g., Trinity Lake, Shasta Lake, Folsom Lake, and Lake Oroville) would be similar to the No Action Alternative (ELT).</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p>
5586	1	Tunnels built at a ridiculous cost, degrading NorCal's one of a kind estuary to bow to big agriculture down south without adding any new water to our supply is not reasonable. It is insane.	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. It is not the result of "favoring" large corporations (e.g., large agribusinesses). In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Change in Delta Exports), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).</p>
5587	1	There are better ways to spend our money on water preservation and distribution!	<p>Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
5588	1	I have enjoyed the Delta all my life, since a child. I want to preserve it for my children and theirs.	<p>Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. For more information regarding Delta as a Place please see Master Response 24.</p>
5589	1	I'm signing because this will completely destroy the sport fishing industry. I have fished the delta all my life and now my kids fish the delta as well. We would be devastated if this were to pass!	<p>Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required.</p>
5590	1	The water needs to stay where it is native to. Make more reservoirs where they are needed.	<p>Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p>
5591	1	I grew up in the North Delta not 2 miles from the site of the northernmost proposed intake for the Tunnels and I have lived at that location again for the past 13 years. We Deltans knew from the beginning the BDCP was a water grab pretending to be a habitat plan. At least the CA Water Fix is more honest, but that doesn't mean it will work. Taking water "more reliably" (for whom?) from an estuary can never make it healthier, and jeopardizing long-time Delta farmers' water and lands to benefit areas where irrigation has a much shorter history just seems unreasonable.	<p>As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal and State regulating agencies, ESA compliance, and project design. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods.</p> <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>
5592	1	This is a crock and I believe a waste of money. Let's spend the money on new dams and reservoirs. Cutting down on the amount of almond growing may help too.	<p>The proposed project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies needed to meet California's overall water management needs. It is not a substitute for increased commitments to other water supply solutions, including recycling, desalination, water conservation and storage. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management and Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives.</p> <p>Providing regulatory oversight to agribusinesses is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. The Lead Agencies do not have land use planning authorities (such as changing local land uses and zoning ordinances or controlling what crops should be planted).</p> <p>Regarding water use, the proposed project does not make determinations regarding how water delivered through the proposed project conveyance or other water conveyance facility will be put to a beneficial use. The State Water Resources Control Board is charged with the comprehensive planning and allocation of water resources in California. Please refer to Master Response 34 for additional details on the beneficial use</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			of water.
5593	1	The water grab needs to stop the Delta is not a water source for SoCal.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders.
5594	1	Destroying the delta to make a few richer is wrong!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5595	1	I am signing because I do not agree with building the tunnels. I use the delta for fishing and recreation. I have been following the development of the proposal and think there are better alternatives to CA's water problems.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need.
5596	1	The governor's plan is absurdly expensive. The money could be better used to provide desalination plants for the local water needs instead of further ruining the Delta.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
5597	1	There are alternative ways to attain water without affecting the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. 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.
5598	1	We need to keep our water here.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders.
5599	1	That's an expensive, bad idea.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5600	1	I grew up on the Delta and we cannot allow it to be ruined to keep giving our water to SoCal, which by the way is not even rationing by allowing their lawns to die.	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).</p>
5601	1	Destructive to the environment.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5601	2	Stealing water from agriculture and fisheries.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environment impacts in the EIR/S were raised.
5601	3	Southern California should store and manage their own rainfall and stop relying on northern California.	<p>Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
5602	1	The Delta Tunnels not only are environmentally irresponsible, the project is also fiscally irresponsible. Who does the corrupt Jerry Brown owe this time to sell out the state? Brown needs to go.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5603	1	We give enough of our resources away. Eventually the water gets there in the same place for free.	<p>As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.</p> <p>The proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months and in drier years; and increase exports in the wet winter months in wetter years when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods. Please refer to Master Response 5.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5604	1	I want to help preserve our natural waterways.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5605	1	The tunnels will decimate the Delta wildlife!	The lead agencies disagree that the project will result in the effects hypothesized by the commenter. Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect natural communities and plant and wildlife species. The chapter describes the impacts, both negative and positive, and discusses measures that would be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts and to compensate for significant impacts.
5606	1	I don't want the tunnels and want to protect our environment and save the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5607	1	It's not going to be rational water conservation. It's unsustainable. It's a big boondocks to make money. It will kill the Delta and marshlands master plan.	The issue raised 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.
5608	1	I'm signing because I don't believe damaging such a valuable resource as the Delta to grow almond trees in a desert makes no sense.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environment impacts in the EIR/S were raised. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
5609	1	I oppose these tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5610	1	I opposed the Peripheral Canal. I am aware, as a fisherman, how much the Delta and the San Francisco Bay has already been changed by mismanagement. I have seen and heard too many examples of what (how many?) years have done to the fishing populations and habitat. And now you want to build a mechanism that'll put huge pressure on an already fragile ecosystem. Sorry, I oppose this crime completely.	The commenter does not offer any evidence on how the project would result in Delta ecosystem impacts related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5611	1	I believe the California WaterFix project is a threat to the health of the Delta. I also disagree with supplying water to large agriculture customers for their benefit over the health of the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
5612	1	These 60 billion dollar tunnels will destroy California Delta economy, fisheries and lifestyle, while raising water rates for Southern California municipal users to accommodate billionaire corporate agriculture growing unsustainable crops that are largely exported!	The project would cost approximately \$15 billion to build. There would be additional costs for mitigation of approximately \$800 million. Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on the costs of project implementation.
5613	1	Southern California is wasting what little water we have!	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).</p>
5614	1	Citizens need water to survive and this whole thing is a huge waste of money and drains more water from citizens. No.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports).
5615	1	I love the recreation and habitat of the Delta and do not want it tapped out. California should be more sustainable with its water. Keep it local where it belongs. We don't even have enough here.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5616	1	I feel the tunnels would hurt our local economy as well as take water away from us.	Under Alternative 4A, additional regional employment and income could create net positive effects on the character of Delta communities. 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. Please refer to Master Response 26 regarding exports.
5617	1	The tunnels will further increase the salinity in the Delta and will decrease the flushing needed for a healthy Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
5618	1	I live on the water in Stockton. The Delta is beautiful -- the tunnels will destroy it.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5619	1	I don't want the Delta changed.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5620	1	This water grab would irreparably damage the Delta. It is more detrimental than helpful in addressing California water issues. A project this costly that adversely impacts so many individuals should not go forward without allowing Californians to vote on it.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS.
5621	1	We need our water up here in the north. They need to build a desalination plant in the	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		south to get their water from the ocean.	
5622	1	Bad business and ecologically destructive. Do the train instead, or set up desalinization systems. Times are changing, weather is changing. The Delta tunnels project is perhaps too expensive for the low yield during drought years. Look back to the destruction of Tulare Lake. That used to be a great asset to California. Now it's all gone. Please be careful with the ecological ramifications of the Delta Tunnel Project.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. As a project prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need. Also, please see Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Additionally, please refer to Master Response 7 for information on desalination and why it was not included as a project alternative.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 5 for information on project costs and funding.</p>
5623	1	Jerry Brown will otherwise sell us out.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5624	1	I'm signing because I grew up on the Delta and I plan on my children, and my children's children doing the same.	Please refer to Master Response 45 regarding the purpose and need for the project. For more information regarding Delta as a Place please see Master Response 24.
5625	1	The Delta is not for sale, stop messing with our natural resources. This Delta is a big part of the economic growth, it provides jobs to longshoremen here in Stockton as well as others. This is a bad bad idea just say no use some common sense.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. As described in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, under Alternative 4, Impact ECON-1, construction employment is estimated to peak at 2,427 FTE jobs in year 3. Total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) would peak in year 12, at 8,673 FTE jobs. Direct agricultural employment would be reduced by an estimated 16 FTE jobs, while total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) associated with agricultural employment would fall by 57 FTE jobs. Because construction of water conveyance facilities would result in an increase in construction-related employment and labor income, this would be considered a beneficial effect.
5626	1	This is an unnecessary use of resources and money. Not to mention the impact it will have on the environment.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), and Master Response 5 (Costs and Funding).
5627	1	I live on the Delta in Discovery Bay. I am concerned if the enviromental impact it will cause as well as the repercussions it will have on home and property values that have still not recovered from the crash a few years ago. More families will have to walk away from homes and businesses if the Delta is harmed from the tunnels.	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. As described in Impact ECON-3 in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics for Alternative 4A, property values may decline in areas that become less desirable in which to live, work, shop, or participate in recreational activities. For instance, negative visual- or noise-related effects on residential property could lead to localized abandonment of buildings. While water conveyance construction could result in beneficial effects relating to the economic welfare of a community, adverse social effects could also arise as a result of declining economic stability in communities closest to construction effects and in those most heavily influenced by agricultural and recreational activities. 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).
5627	2	Southern California can build desalination plants and underground catch basins to capture water for their use. With the amount of rain they have had this year it would	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,

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		have been a great idea.	<p>treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives.</p>
5628	1	These tunnels are a bad idea. Period. Taking ever more water from the North of the State to feed developers and Corporate farmers in the southern central valley will only make the North drier, and deprive the Delta of water it needs to stay a living ecosystem. It will not relieve the thirst of the greedy developers and ag giants of the south.	As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.
5629	1	We should not be diverting water from the Delta. We don't even have any water!	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders.
5630	1	This is going to destroy Northern and Central California. There has to come a time when the State Governor thinks about what is best for the people and the state. Southern California needs to set up tanks to do desalination of the saltwater to meet their needs, it is a much cheaper idea and leave things alone that work.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
5631	1	Enough is enough. No more water should flow to the south of the Delta. And the Delta must be preserved.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5632	1	I believe it's an environmental catastrophe, it benefits few, it's too costly and it puts small Delta farmers out of business.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 539 (Cost and Funding), Master Response 24 (Delta As a Place), and Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation).
5633	1	It's not okay to destroy our river and the life in it to send water elsewhere. This is a short-sighted plan that will cause an environmental nightmare. Not only that, those of us whose city water comes from the Delta will suffer. There simply isn't enough.	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.</p> <p>Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p>
5634	1	I'm signing because the Delta is California's #1 water source for agriculture as well as a huge ecosystem for a variety of birds, reptiles, and fish. The Delta is a huge tourist attraction as well as one of California's best sport fishing locations. Being an agriculturist as well as an outdoorsman has taught me the importance of California waterways. We need to keep the Delta "The Delta" and not the "Twin Tunnels".	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5635	1	I want to protect the Delta that I grew up living next to.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5636	1	I farmed 300 acres and still hold leased acreage in the Delta and rely on fresh water for livestock and crops.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. In its efforts to achieve the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration, the California WaterFix seeks to protect dozens of species of fish and wildlife in the Delta while also securing reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California. Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed California WaterFix.
5636	2	We were successful in defeating the Peripheral Canal. If the peripheral canals are built, the State will back away from assisting with funding for levee upgrades as they will claim that non project levees (unlike state and federal funded levees) are no longer critical to sustaining the quality of water exported to the South. Eventually the non project levee owner/ Rec districts will no longer afford to maintain their levees and the DWR will move, once again, to purchase cheap Delta farm land for false "restoration". The Delta will become an inland saline or at best brackish inland bay unfit for farming, fish or recreation.	<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 Chapter 3 in the FEIR/EIS for a description of the new proposed project, Alternative 4A. The proposed project does not include a surface canal to convey water through the Delta and substantially reduces the amount of habitat restoration footprint compared to the previously preferred BDCP HCP alternative, Alternative 4.</p>
5637	1	This is a beautiful resource and I want to preserve it for my children.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5638	1	The tunnels are a gross misuse of public funds for predominantly private benefit. They will result in both ecological damage and economic damage to the Delta region.	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.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
5639	1	Delta water needs to be shared equitably.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders.
5640	1	We didn't want it then, and we don't want it now.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5641	1	I oppose the tunnels- bad for the valley.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5642	1	The tunnels will decimate the Delta and the farmlands of Northern California.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5643	1	Save the environment, the farmers, and the cities that depend on that water already. Get your water somewhere else.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5644	1	This will hurt the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5645	1	I believe that hurting the ecology of the Delta and its recreation, farming, and fish/animals to grow almonds in places where they weren't meant to grow is just plain wrong.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. 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.
5646	1	The tunnels will harm the Delta and supply corporations with water, but the land that will be irrigated with that water should have never been planted in the first place.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5647	1	I love the Delta! Please don't ruin it by digging it up and adding tunnels. We are already in a horrible drought and now you wanna send our water elsewhere? Doesn't make any sense.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The proposed project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports). 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.
5648	1	Southern California (Los Angeles) needs to find other ways to meet its water demand.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5649	1	I am worried that this project may be a knee-jerk reaction to the current drought conditions. I am also concerned about our water shortage, but I am more concerned of the permanent impact that these tunnels will have on our coastal wildlife, and the extra taxes that will be generated on the already overtaxed population of California.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Funding).
5650	1	The Delta Tunnels proposal is an environmental train wreck. Save the sustaina-babble. The fix is in for this fix for Big Agriculture. Money would be better spent helping family farms- -- that is, helping families who work the land, who care enough to maintain its life-giving properties.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use Of Water), Master Response 18 (Agricultural Mitigation) and Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).
5651	1	Governor Brown's proposed three 35'-diameter Northern California water-diverting tunnels would be destructive of the endangered salmon along with other endangered fish and birds, and also be destructive of Bay-Delta farmers -- it is a bad proposal that needs to get stopped.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation).
5652	1	We don't want the tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5653	1	This will destroy the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5654	1	This is not a logical or environmental course of action. Water needs to be undisturbed instead of further upsetting the ecosystem. This is an opportunity to be forward-thinking and understand that we must stop disrupting the nature of things.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5655	1	If these are allowed to be built the East Bay could have the same fate as Owens Valley, which was destroyed by greedy water mismanagement.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 18 (Changes in Delta Exports).
5656	1	Taking more water from the north to give to the south will not help the Delta.	By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The proposed project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports). 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.
5657	1	This cannot be allowed. We voted and said no. Show the powers people come first. Leave the Delta alone.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 36 (Peripheral Canal).
5658	1	I am a fisherman and see firsthand how this insane plan by Governor Brown will not help but destroy an already fragile ecosystem.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5659	1	I disagree with sending already sparse water to a historically dry region which is sent for water-intensive agriculture.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). The proposed project would not increase the amount of water to which SWP and CVP hold water rights for use allowed under their contracts and permits and approvals for refuge water supplies or other environmental purposes.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5660	1	I am not for the tunnels. No!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5661	1	It is enough! It is obvious, from other mega-projects, that just sucking up water wherever it flows is disastrous in the long run. I do not want to see another Colorado River running dry into Mexico. In this case, the Sacramento running dry into the Bay.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. 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.
5662	1	Meg Whitman promised to divert water from Delta by an executive order during her election. I remember what happened in 2002 when such an order caused a fish kill in the [tens] of thousands on the Klamath.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5663	1	The tunnels are a terrible idea. You cannot water with salt water.	Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the EIR/EIS discloses the potential water quality impacts resulting from constructing and operating the proposed project. See also Master Response 14 (Water Quality).
5664	1	It would be a better idea to have the people/communities/local governments learn how to use less water. Climate change and rising sea levels will be a big enough challenge for the Delta to adapt to.	Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.
5664	2	Sandhill cranes have been using that island for millennia [and] they do not change their ways easily. The idea that you can have them use a new area is absurd; they are not genetically wired that way. Please work out an alternative or 5!	Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect sandhill cranes. The chapter describes the impacts, both negative and positive, and discusses measures that would be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts and to compensate for significant impacts.
5665	1	We have to save the integrity of the Delta. Find another way!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5666	1	There are better solutions for water usage in Southern California.	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.
5667	1	I'm trying to save our Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5668	1	Other methods must be addressed before we take a chance on ruining this valuable ecosystem in our Delta. I'm surprised at Governor Brown, as he has made many good decisions. This is a bad one.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 4 (Alternatives).
5669	1	I like to fish, and am sick of the farmers and [expletive] Los Angeles taking Northern California water with zero regard for its effect.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Refer to Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).
5670	1	This plan is an insane waste of money and our natural resource, not to mention the devastating effect it will have on the Delta.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Funding).
5671	1	We're Delta sailors and see firsthand how the tunnels would devastate river life!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5672	1	This has to be one of the most insane ideas I've ever heard of! Save the estuaries, you bureaucratic morons! And stop trying to grow lush green lawns in your climate!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5673	1	Tunnels are not creating new water.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environment impacts in the EIR/S were raised. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5674	1	Diverting more water from an already damaged Delta will be murderous to salmonids.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5675	1	Our environment and water don't need to go south for any reason.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5676	1	I oppose the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5677	1	Naturally functioning watersheds are superior to manmade infrastructure. Bring back a properly functioning Delta instead!	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor any change in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. 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. 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.
5678	1	The Delta needs restorations, not exploitations.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5679	1	This will destroy California's largest fisheries, salt intrusion will be a larger problem, groundwater, lots of farm land will become unfarmable. Governor Brown should be telling his mega-farm friends at the south end of the valley to stop farming ground that has no water to begin with. You know what is next -- Los Angeles. Los Angeles has destroyed more lakes, reservoirs, and rivers, so we are next if the tunnels are not stopped. This will destroy Northern California as we know it. The only people that will benefit will be the mega-farms at the south end of the valley and Los Angeles. We will pay for it with no benefit to you and Northern California. I demand that you, Governor Brown, stop wasting our tax money on this totally wrong tunnel nightmare and put your effort and our money into more storage that all of California can benefit from. Stop the tunnels.	<p>The proposed project was developed 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 roughly the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> <p>Refer to Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply), 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), and Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding).</p>
5680	1	I don't believe the BDCP is a true solution to our water issues. You can't transport water that doesn't exist. In addition, I have serious concerns about the environmental and political impact on the Delta region.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5681	1	Theses tunnels would be an economic, environmental, and agricultural disaster for all of California.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation), and Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding).
5682	1	The water tunnels are a taxpayer boondoggle that won't help make it rain in Northern California.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5683	1	I have a million farmer friends who will sell their land if this goes through.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5684	1	It's a bad idea to the health of our Delta waters.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5685	1	This is nothing more than a water rip-off by the agencies that take water out of the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5686	1	Water should stay here.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5687	1	We've had more than enough investment in California water projects from congressional members' private funds. That is what got us into this mess [and] now we must suffer the consequences of our choices. Investing in more water projects is unintuitive.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5688	1	We need to save our waterways: once depleted, there is no saving them.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5689	1	I want to save the Delta. I live in the Delta and it's magnificent. [The tunnels] would destroy the marine life and force salt water into the Delta, along with predators such as sharks.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 14 (Salinity).
5690	1	I've seen firsthand agriculture in the Central Valley and all they care about is economic sustainability. They are fiercely against environmentalist or any environmental policies that cut into their profit margins. Delta farmers started farming in the Delta over 100 years ago and chose the area due to the adequate water supply. If too much water is diverted this will be detrimental to the Delta, surrounding farmers, and wildlife at the cost of the big greedy agriculture and oil in the Central Valley.	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.
5691	1	It's just plain wrong!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5692	1	This was a bad idea the first time.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5693	1	Why not build the tunnels into Oregon? That's where the water is!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 REIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5694	1	I am strongly opposed to the Delta tunnel project for multiple reasons. Why are we further destroying the Delta for the benefit of corporate agriculture in the Valley, who already demonstrate their unwillingness to adapt to the carrying capacity of the land [and] water they already have?	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. It is not the result of "favoring" large corporations (e.g., large agribusinesses). In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), and Master Response 26 (Change in Delta Exports).
5695	1	There has been so much environmental damage with our current system, it only makes it worse. This is a bad idea because water is here for a reason -- and we need it. We are the food capital of the world. Stop messing with nature and bad medicine.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5696	1	I oppose the tunnels. They are bad for California.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5697	1	I am strongly against the Delta tunnels. Our water needs to remain here for small, local farms. Our water is way too precious of a resource to ship off.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports).
5698	1	I oppose the tunnel project for numerous reasons, including: it has no provisions to protect habitat for endangered salmon and smelt and more than 50 other imperiled species; the tunnels would destroy the food and habitat availability for migratory birds and terrestrial species that depend on the Delta ecosystem to survive; and the tunnels would divert water away from the sustainable, multi-generational farms of the Delta. Most importantly, every scientific panel, ranging from the Delta Independent Science Board to the National Academy of Sciences, has criticized the flawed "science" behind the twin tunnel plan.	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, Master Response 17 regarding mitigation for impacts to terrestrial species and smelt, Master Response 5 regarding the environmental benefits of water conveyance facilities, and Master Response 24 (Delta as A Place). See also Chapter 11 (Aquatic Resources) and Chapter 12 (Terrestrial Resources) of the EIR/EIS for information on impacts to aquatic and terrestrial species and mitigation for these impacts. For responses to comments related to the Delta Independent Science Board's letters, please refer to comment letters BDCP 1448 and/or RECIRC 2546.
5699	1	Save the Delta. Divide the State of California. Southern California needs to stop taking our water and using it for their swimming pools and expanding their population.	The comment raises import policy issues concerning sustainable growth, water supplies in California. However, the comment does not question the growth inducement analysis or conclusions of Chapter 30.
5700	1	I live in the Delta and don't wish to see it destroyed.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5701	1	Water needs to stay here in Northern California.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5702	1	This will harm residents and farmers in the Sacramento region, as well as hurt our environment.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place).
5703	1	I care about my state and the Delta. It's not right, what Mr. Brown is trying to do to	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Northern California.	
5704	1	I believe the Delta is a unique, beautiful, and productive environment that provides enormous natural, ecological, agricultural, aesthetic, and recreational value to our society, and that the construction and operation of the tunnels would irreparably harm the Delta ecosystem and substantially diminish its value to society.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5705	1	Destroying the Delta is not the way to solve California's water problems.	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.
5706	1	The tunnels project is self-serving, shortsighted, and completely unnecessary.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5707	1	This is not the best plan you can come up with. Stop being lazy and selfish.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5708	1	We need to keep the Delta the way it is and not hurt one of our #1 economies, which is agriculture, and save the family farms.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 45 (Purpose and Need). Impacts to agriculture are identified and discussed in Chapter 14; lead agencies have proposed measures that would support and protect agricultural production in the Delta by securing agricultural easements and/or by seeking opportunities to protect and enhance agriculture with a focus on maintaining economic activity on agricultural lands. Please see Master Response 18 for more information on agricultural mitigation.
5709	1	The Shasta Lake resources are not an adequate reservoir for the San Francisco Bay's needs for fresh water to hold back ocean saltwater intrusions and to stabilize the geological infrastructure of the Bay. The money can be better spent on collecting and recycling grey water as well as collecting rainwater runoff.	It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project. 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.
5710	1	I live in the Sacramento River watershed and strongly oppose the California WaterFix, the Governor's latest plan to drain the vitality from the north state. Our homes, businesses, farms, and wildlands depend on healthy groundwater, creeks, and streams.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		In fact, all of California depends on the water that flows from the headwaters of California through the Sacramento River Valley. No Twin Tunnels!	from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports).
5711	1	The Tunnels plan would be devastating to the ecology and economy of the San Francisco Bay-Delta region.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5712	1	I am a local from the north state and have seen how much it has dried up in the last 10 years. We grow so much rice and almonds and other food for the rest of the world, these tunnels would be the end of life as we know it to the north state while we are already in a terrible state of decay and drought. These tunnels are the last thing we need!	DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.
5713	1	This [WaterFix project] is a waste of so much money for all the wrong reasons.	DWR acknowledges your opposition to the project. Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on the costs of project implementation.
5714	1	We only have so much nature left. We need to change our minds to preserve at all costs.	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.
5715	1	I don't want to see our estuary die.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5716	1	This [WaterFix project] is a terrible idea for local environment and citizens that need this water. Let Los Angeles deal with their issues with their resources, not ours.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
5717	1	I oppose these tunnels because they will destroy our Delta estuary and the farmland that produces our food and helps to feed the world.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5718	1	I don't think we should destroy a beautiful estuary, like the Stockton Delta, so we can send water to Southern California. The idea is too expensive and won't solve California's problem as long as the drought conditions exist. Building more dams in Southern California would be a better idea to store what limited rain falls during this or future droughts.	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p>
5719	1	We need water to grow America's food!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5720	1	I oppose SB-1894 [and] HR-2998 as they are short-sighted!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5721	1	I'm inspired by the work Ryan and Restore the Delta are taking on. Stopping water privatization and the destruction of water ecosystems is essential for a more just and ecologically stable future.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
5722	1	Agriculture is vital to California but one part of California should not be saved at the expense of another's livelihood. Dams and water storage can be made and then water can be transported. So much water is wasted without the proper storage now. And shipping water south will only kill the Delta and the farmers here. There must be a better way where we all can live in California together and not at the expense of one over the other.	<p>Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p>
5723	1	The Delta is a cherished and highly utilized body of water by the surrounding citizens. We don't need to disrupt the Delta to feed another region. That region needs to be	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		self-sustaining just as we are here.	<p>rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).</p>
5724	1	Leave the Delta alone. Tell Southern California almond growers to plant hemp.	The commenter does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS.
5725	1	I love the Delta [and] we can't destroy it for [one] person.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5726	1	[The WaterFix is] not a good idea for the environment and the farmers with property going back several generations.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5727	1	Tunnels will destroy Northern California agriculture and wildlife habitat.	The issue raised 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. Resource areas are addressed separately under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible. Refer to Master Response 17 (Terrestrial Impact Mitigation) and Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation).
5728	1	Common sense tells you this is a very bad project.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5729	1	The twin tunnels are stupid and dangerous to our Delta and families and farms in Northern California. Why not spend the water districts' money developing new water? I don't trust state government to only fill them part of the time. They are vampire pipes that will drain the Delta any time they want to.	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.
5730	1	I don't support increased state water to agriculture.	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
5731	1	This is absolutely ridiculous. Jerry Brown must understand this is not a fix.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5732	1	The Delta is already starved for fresh water, and the Delta Tunnels will further degrade the Delta ecosystem. The Delta needs help, but tunnels are not the answer.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS.
5733	1	Quit messing with our waterways! Haven't we [and] the land suffered enough?	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5734	1	Let the Delta alone. It's here for a reason.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5735	1	I'm concerned about the impact that the mass removal of water from the Delta would have on the local environment and the Pacific Flyway. Please don't waste our tax dollars ruining our state!	As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 5.
5736	1	Water [ought] to stay where it belongs. How much do we have to give up?	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26. 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.
5737	1	I want to help save the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5738	1	I do not want to ruin the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5739	1	Water is already scarce and this won't help.	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26. 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.
5740	1	I have fished the Delta over 60 years and have seen firsthand the devastation of sending more water south.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass and Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need. Additionally, fishing is already considered in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required. Please refer to Master Response 44 regarding exports.
5741	1	I am strongly opposed to the twin tunnels. The last decade has been proof enough that there is not enough water to export out of the Delta as experienced with decimated fish populations and the Delta turning into a swamp due to a lack of natural flows of water from existing pumping conditions. During the last decade we have also witnessed increased pumping and exporting of Delta water that shows the more water is exported the [more] fish populations have decreased. There is a direct correlation. There is also scientific proof that no more than 30% of the water currently being taken from the Delta/Sacramento is all that should be taken under normal years of snowpack to allow for any kind of sustainability of our Delta ecosystem. Why in the world would we want to build billion-dollar tunnels knowing that there is not enough water in normal years to export? I am opposed to the twin tunnels. Other alternatives are available and our politicians are not paying attention to what the people are demanding.	<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 almost 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>
5742	1	This [WaterFix project] is a bad idea for fish, wildlife, Delta farmers, drinking water, boaters, etc.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5743	1	I oppose the Delta Tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5744	1	There are more cost-effective, environmentally sound alternatives to this destructive plan.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. 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.
5745	1	This plan will not solve California's water deficit, and will destroy valuable and productive farm business in the Sacramento 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.
5746	1	Friends of the River have studied the damage to the Delta that will come if this project of two twin tunnels moves forward, and I oppose this project on the damage it will cause to the Delta ecosystem and all Californians.	The project would include avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures to mitigate the project's effects on sensitive biological resources. Chapter 11 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses measures to protect aquatic ecosystems, and Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses measures to protect terrestrial ecosystems.
5747	1	The tunnels will destroy the Delta and not add water to the system. I live in the Delta and [they] will take away my good drinking water.	<p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Resources Control Board on the Sacramento, river with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The State Water Resources Control Board, not DWR and Reclamation, is responsible for decisions relating to water rights. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.</p> <p>Considerations of adverse impacts to Delta water users due to implementation of the action alternatives (not climate change, sea level rise, or projected population growth that would have occurred with or without the proposed project) are discussed in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, and Chapter 20, Public Services and Utilities. Changes in Delta water quality that could affect Delta water users are discussed in Chapter 8, Water Quality, including changes in bromide, chloride, and electrical conductivity.</p>
5748	1	The water transfer scheme will destroy the Delta, its habitat, and its communities.	<p>The Proposed Project is not a water transfer program. In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.</p> <p>Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS. Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods.</p>
5749	1	I totally disagree with what the state is doing to the California Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5750	1	I have attended hearings and studied the materials. I believe this is a very bad idea. As	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		a native Californian, I am opposed to this harmful, destructive, greedy proposition.	standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5751	1	The tunnels will not generate or store new water. It is only increasing the consumption of the limited water supply. Spend the money on water production solutions. Cut water usage in Southern California and invest in solutions to get Southern California water.	<p>Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
5752	1	It's a dumb, stupid plan, simply put.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5753	1	The Governor is wrong and acting against existing law regarding common pool, water quality and surplus water.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5754	1	[I want] to keep fresh water in Northern California and to prevent the significant and inevitable increase in salinity to the Bay and Delta if the tunnels are built. To me, this is not about the smelt. It is not about an environmentalist agenda. It is about the entire fishery. It is not about greedy farmers. It's about sustaining our fresh water supply to keep those farmers in business.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports) and Master Response 14 (Salinity).
5755	1	I don't want the Delta destroyed and the water shipped south.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5756	1	I visit the Delta multiple times a year and I would hate to see any changes take place in this beautiful landscape. Not to mention all the people who will be affected first hand by destroying their land.	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.</p>
5757	1	I do not want tunnels built without all proper environmental issues addressed and followed. If they cannot meet all requirements then the tunnels must not be forced upon us by a one sided administration without proper representation and the ability to vote on it.	The proposed project is a joint RDEIR/SDEIS prepared in compliance with the requirements of CEQA and NEPA. 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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).</p> <p>For more information please see 1.1.5 of Section 1 Introduction of the RDERI/SDEIS.</p> <p>The Federal and State Lead Agencies have done their best to make the EIR/EIS for the BDCP as fair, objective, and complete as possible. 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>
5758	1	This is a bad plan that will not address the new, chronic drought that California is undergoing. It will cost billions of dollars and not work.	<p>As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.</p> <p>The proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months and in drier years; and increase exports in the wet winter months in wetter years when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods. 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 address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management). These actions are being considered to meet future water demands for planned municipal uses consistent with water demand projections in the recent Urban Water Management Plans submitted to DWR which include approaches to meet the 20 percent per capita urban water use by 2020.</p>
5759	1	I'm signing [the petition] because every authentic scientific study has proven that the diversion of Delta waters will destroy the San Joaquin/Sacramento River deltas as well as the San Francisco Bay wetlands. Why does the Governor think he knows more than the NOAA and other scientific bodies?	<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>
5760	1	The tunnels will provide no additional water, unlike other proven strategies; is an unconscionable waste of our money and resources, and along with unforeseen	As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>consequences, will definitely harm agriculture and wildlife and human habitat in a way that may never be remedied. Furthermore, the manner in which the project is being shoved down our throats regardless of mass objections borders on criminal neglect of our elected officials' duty to work in the best interests of all citizens.</p>	<p>and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal and State regulating agencies, ESA compliance, and project design. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods.</p> <p>A cornerstone of the proposed project is to construct and operate a dual-conveyance water delivery system that would modernize the heart of the California's aging water supply network in a way that better balances the needs of the Delta ecosystem and the 25 million Californians and 600,000 agricultural acres that rely on it. The proposed north Delta intakes would allow water operators to take a "big gulp, little sip" approach--exporting large volumes of water in wet months and years and exporting smaller volumes in drier months and years. Dual conveyance operations would allow water to be exported, when it is available, from both the proposed north Delta intakes and the existing south Delta intakes to areas south of the Delta. Stored water can then be used in dryer months and years when water exports are limited to protect fish and water quality in the Delta, increasing water supply reliability for south of Delta users. In some months and years, conditions at the south Delta pumps do not permit diversions in order to protect fish. The proposed facilities in the northern Delta would also allow operators the flexibility to capture water that would otherwise flow out to the ocean when diversions at the south delta are limited to avoid harm to fish. In dry months and years, water exports from the proposed north Delta intakes and the existing south Delta pumps would be limited to "little sips" to be protective of fisheries and water quality. At all times, the proposed Delta operations, including exports and outflows, would be based on the protective operational criteria included in the BDCP and on actual hydrological and ecological conditions. This approach would give water operators the flexibility they need to respond to changing circumstances due to climate change to protect fisheries and water quality while securing reliable water supplies for the 25 million Californians and 600,000 agricultural acres that depend on exports from the Delta.</p> <p>In addition to operational flexibility, the location of the north Delta diversion facility is further inland, making it less vulnerable to salinity intrusion, the potential impacts of sea level rise, severe storms or major earthquakes in the future. Intakes located on the proposed north Delta locations would give state and federal water operators access to fresh water to meet human and environmental needs even in the event of sea level rise or a seismic induced levee failures that might allow saltwater to surge into the interior Delta.</p> <p>Comments have been received from a broad range of stakeholders, including local governments, elected officials, environmental, business, labor and community groups, and individuals. State and federal agencies have carefully reviewed comments and prepared responses and in some cases, they were the impetus for the changes to Alternative 4 and the analysis seen in the RDEIR/SDEIS and the creation of Alternatives 4A, 2D and 5A.</p>
5761	1	This project will cause massive environmental damage to the south Delta wildlife	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		including migratory birds and native fish. The sludge from the digging the tunnels will create greenhouse gases and foul smells as the organic peat soil decomposes releasing greenhouse gases like methane.	Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. For information on impacts to migratory birds see Chapter 12 (Terrestrial Resources) and native fish see Chapter 11 (Aquatic Resources). For more information on concerns regarding reusable tunnel material see Master Response 12.
5762	1	I object to installing tunnels to send water to southern California because we don't have enough water here in northern California.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.
5763	1	Save the water fowl and preserve natural events.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5764	1	I opposed the tunnels because they will destroy the Delta and our farmland.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation).
5765	1	I am a property owner in the Delta. I believe these tunnels will destroy the Delta. Big agriculture needs to change their farming practices to use less water.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.
5766	1	We oppose the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5767	1	The project will destroy the Delta as we know it.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5768	1	The governor's proposal doesn't solve the water problem. Better solution is desalination!	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
5769	1	The Delta matters and when the diversions are in and the Delta is ruined, we'll never be able to get it back.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5770	1	I oppose the tunnels because it will destroy the entire ecosystem of the Delta as we know it. You need to do a complete study of the Delta, not this rushed idea that is trying to be shoved down our throats. The science is wrong!	<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.</p> <p>Chapters 11 and 12 Final EIR/EIS describe the project's expected effects, based on the best available data. In addition, both chapters present measures that would avoid and minimize impacts and compensate for significant impacts.</p>
5771	1	I oppose the plan to build the Delta tunnels. This plan does not create nor does it store water. It only supports special interest groups at tax payer expense. It is also alarmingly destructive to the Delta ecosystem. No tunnels!	<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 exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high to improve conditions for aquatic resources in the Delta. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in 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). Please refer to Master Responses 3, 4, and 37 related development of new storage facilities in other projects and this Proposed Project.</p>
5772	1	Leave some water in the Delta! Stop the environmental degradation!	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.
5773	1	Don't screw up the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5774	1	We must preserve the Delta!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5775	1	I believe natural habitat should stay as natural as possible.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5776	1	I am against the senseless waste in proceeding with the tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5777	1	I love the Delta and want my kids to grow up on the Delta. It is the best things for families. We need camping, boating and fishing in our lives.	Recreation areas that would be directly impacted by the proposed project are listed in Table 15-15 of Chapter 15, Recreation. Many mitigation measures and environmental commitments would reduce impacts to visitors whenever possible. Fishing would still be accessible throughout the Delta during construction, although it would be restricted in the direct vicinity of construction areas. Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass, and to Impacts REC-2, 4, 5, and 9 for a discussion of impacts to fishing from the proposed project, as well as Alternative 4A in Chapter 15, Recreation, Impacts REC-3 and 7 regarding boating.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5778	1	Reduced water flows through the Delta will destroy the ecosystem, the fisheries and will allow salt water intrusion; contaminating the fertile Delta farmland unproductive. It will destroy the farming industry in the Delta. The cost overruns of the Bay Bridge illustrate how government intentionally underestimates costs. This project will be a waste of tax payer funds. The funds might be better spent on reservoirs.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 14 (Salinity), Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation), Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding), and Master Response 37 (Storage).
5779	1	I think the diversion of fresh water through these tunnels could be catastrophic for the for the estuary.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
5780	1	Let us find better ways of sharing precious California water than the "robbing Peter to pay Paul" fix which the "Delta Tunnels" represents.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.
5781	1	I am signing because I oppose the Delta Tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5782	1	I am deeply concerned about the health of the ecosystem of the Delta. The tunnels will further impact the flow in the Delta from Clarksburg to San Francisco. The lack of flows due to the drought are already effecting the health of the Delta; the tunnels would only exacerbate the problem.	By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The proposed project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports). 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. Chapter 11 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect aquatic ecosystems. Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect terrestrial ecosystems. Both chapters describe the impacts, both negative and positive, and discuss the mitigation measures and avoidance and minimization measures proposed to avoid and minimize impacts and to compensate for significant impacts.
5783	1	The tunnel proposal is being rushed through without dull discussion of other options.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. 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.
5784	1	BDCP is a fix, it will fix the bank accounts of the mega agribusiness almond growers and commercial real estate developers in Southern California who contribute to Governor Brown and Senator Feinstein. Sucking so much water out of the Delta will destroy the water quality, kill protected species, ruin the Delta's economy and endanger the health of millions of people who swim in and boat on the beautiful water of the Delta. You	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; refer to Master Response 41 (Transparency) for more information. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		must not let Southern California interests do to the California Delta what they did to the Owens River and its valley. The hundred pages of the revised EIR are only meant to obfuscate the truly destructive nature of the Fix. Why did you move the river sampling point from a Delta source at Three Mile Slough to outside the Delta at Emmaton? Why do you use the Latin name Microcystis rather than the common name toxic blue green algae? And why do you make it so hard to find data on the volumes of water taken by the two thirty-five foot tunnels?	<p>volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The proposed project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports). 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. For Microcystis, please refer to Master Response 14.</p> <p>Under the stringent environmental statutes in place today, including the Endangered Species Act, operation of the proposed water delivery system could not drain the Delta rivers and channels dry, including the Sacramento River. The proposed project's facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants, would be operated in accordance with permits issued by, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the State Water Resources Control Board, among other agencies. The proposed project would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>Regarding water use by ag or commercial real estate developers, the proposed project does not make determinations regarding how water delivered through the proposed project conveyance or other water conveyance facility will be put to a beneficial use. The State Water Resources Control Board is charged with the comprehensive planning and allocation of water resources in California. One of the State Water Resources Control Board's charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. Please refer to Master Response 34 for additional details on beneficial use.</p> <p>Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).</p>
5785	1	There is only so much water, and to transport it south is the height of ecological stupidity.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.
5786	1	We need to protect our state's wildlife.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5787	1	I am signing because there are better solutions. So save the Delta system for future generations.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. 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.
5788	1	I live on the water and it is going to ruin all fish and wildlife through disturbing their natural habitats that millions of fish and wildlife depend on for their conservation. Please rethink this horrible idea and make the south steal water from their own area.	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Depleting one area to ruin another makes sense, almond growers are not more important than an ecosystem that will die so we can eat an almond.	<p>portions of the Delta ecosystem, as described in Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need, of the EIR/EIS. Operation of the project 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 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 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 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>
5789	1	Destruction of habitat is horribly short-sighted.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
5790	1	This project would be a disaster for our estuaries and goes against the environmental progress we stand for as a state and as a party.	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.
5791	1	I am a friend of the river and feel we need holistic restoration, not further fragmentation.	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.
5792	1	I live near the Delta and it will affect us all in a negative way! Stop the tunnels! Or we will get the EPA involved.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).
5793	1	This is a crazy plan to make a profit on water. Water that is needed to sustain the Bay Area's ecosystem.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project and 44 regarding changes in Delta exports.
5794	1	I want to stop the tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5795	1	Those dollars need to be directed to much needed infrastructure improvements/repairs.	The proposed project is intended to help repair the Delta's ecosystem and improve water reliability. Please refer to Master Response 3, Purpose and Need for more details on the project's benefits to the ecological health of the Delta. Please also see Master Response 5 regarding costs of the project and funding.
5796	1	I am signing to protect future generations. So they will know the beauty of the estuary within the Delta. So future students who study the Delta will become inspired to further their education in marine and scientific research they can help all mankind. Please for the sake of our youth do not ruin their futures.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
5797	1	Love the Delta, want to see it preserved.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5798	1	I am signing because as a longtime resident of northern California and past supporter of Jerry Brown, I know there are alternatives to building the tunnels! We must consider the local residents and farmers, not cater to big agriculture. Our water table is sinking and the solution is not supporting the developments of more almond orchards to ship their product overseas. We must have more conservation mainly by the large agricultural growers, they should not be able to use unlimited amounts of our water!	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
5799	1	The tunnels are an attack on the ecosystem of the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5800	1	It is a water steal.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5801	1	The tunnels will destroy our estuary!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5802	1	The Delta is important. The tunnels are not needed, they are just the latest water grab.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.
5803	1	The tunnels will totally destroy the Delta, and it would not create any more water. The only solution is to find ways to create more water storage. As farmers in the Delta we will be doomed by this action.	<p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Resources Control Board on the Sacramento river with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The project considered in the EIR/EIS would not affect water operations on the Tuolumne River or water supplies for the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The State Water Resources Control Board, not DWR and Reclamation, is responsible for decisions relating to water rights. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26.</p> <p>Considerations of adverse impacts to Delta agricultural water users due to implementation of the action alternatives (not climate change, sea level rise, or projected population growth that would have occurred with or without the proposed project) are discussed in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources. Changes in Delta water quality that could affect Delta water users are discussed in Chapter 8, Water Quality, including changes in bromide, chloride, and electrical conductivity.</p>
5804	1	It is a stupid idea.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5805	1	This is a very bad plan of the Delta. I live on the Delta, no tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5806	1	I do not want the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5807	1	I am opposed to the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5808	1	It is more important to preserve wetlands before taking anything away from them.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5809	1	The tunnels are one of the worst ideas the governor has tried to force down California's throat!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5810	1	The Delta is beautiful -- keep it that way.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5811	1	You do not fool with Mother Nature, period.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5812	1	The tunnels are a terrible idea.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5813	1	These tunnels will hurt biodiversity and are a bad idea for California.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5814	1	Tunnels are not the answer to transport water we do not have to water hungry crops and Southern California golf courses! Preserve our Delta. There is only one and it is precious.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). The proposed project would not increase the amount of water to which SWP and CVP hold water rights for use allowed under their contracts and permits and approvals for refuge water supplies or other environmental purposes.</p>
5815	1	I am an avid Delta boater and I see the current ecological crisis happening. The twin tunnels will further destroy what should be left alone.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
5816	1	Save the Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5817	1	We do not need to damage the Delta for water, it is not the answer. What we do need is increased storage. Build more dams. Yes, it is that simple!	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
5818	1	These proposed tunnels will do nothing to provide more water to California but will contribute to the destruction of the Bay and Delta through increased saltwater intrusion. This project is a boondoggle.	<p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Resources Control Board on the Sacramento river with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The State Water Resources Control Board, not DWR and Reclamation, is responsible for decisions relating to water rights. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26. 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>As described in Chapter 8, Water Quality, salinity would increase in the Delta with or without the proposed project due to climate change and sea level rise. Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods. These changes in export patterns do result in salinity increase in some portions of the Delta in some months, such as increased salinity in the central and south Delta due to reduced freshwater flows to the south Delta intakes in drier periods as compared to the No Action Alternative.</p>
5819	1	I was against the peripheral canal that not only robbed fresh water from cleaning out the Bay, but also sucked up fish fry in the pumps destroying some and flush other fish fingerlings south.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5820	1	The Delta and its little towns help me to balance living in an urban area. They are special and unique. They are valuable and important. Please do not destroy them. There has to be a better way.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
5821	1	I believe the tunnels to be a dangerous plan, dangerous to the Delta ecosystem.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5822	1	I am against the tunnels. This will only benefit our government.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5823	1	This is just another water grab. Hello, people, the lakes are already dry. Have you looked at the price of salmon lately? And you wonder why people want to split the state. Governor Brown needs to remove his head from the place the sun never shines. He sucks worse than the first time he was governor!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The proposed project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports). Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5824	1	This tunnel project is an absolute farce. It will do terrible damage to the area it's supposed to be built in. From toxic waste shipped to dump on nearby towns to decimation of small local family farms. For what? The corporate farms in the southern deserts of California? Gross greed!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place), Master Response 18 (Agricultural impact mitigation), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water) and Master Response 35 (Southern California's Water Supply).
5825	1	I don't want [the] tunnels built.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5826	1	I do not want to send more water to Southern California. It is not sustainable and it threatens the Bay-Delta ecosystem. The tunnels are the wrong solution.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The proposed project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports). 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.
5827	1	There are better ways, such as recycling coupled with a brine line to the ocean to prevent salting up of the Central Valley.	The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of one particular water supply augmentation approach and does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the range of alternatives selected and the rationale behind those not considered.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5828	1	I don't want our water to go the Southern California area where folks think nothing of wasting water.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5829	1	Farmers should grow where water already naturally exists! We need this water too, and we moved where the water is/should be. Plain [and] simple.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5830	1	It's an ill-advised plan that will devastate the Delta's fragile ecosystem and hurt the families, farmers, and businesses in the region. It would be a tragedy to ruin the beautiful California Delta!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 24 (Delta As a Place) and Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation).
5831	1	I oppose the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5832	1	We got to vote down the Peripheral Canal; we don't get to vote on the tunnels, and they are even worse.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 36 for information on how this project differs from the peripheral canal.
5833	1	Depleting the Delta water and rerouting [the] water will not only harm the Delta and the greater San Francisco Bay Area. Probably will just increase harm to the entire California ecology.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5834	1	This is not a good move. It will ruin way too much.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5835	1	The tunnels will destroy the Delta [and] its environment and send salt water all the way up to Sacramento. Why does Governor Brown want to destroy the wonderful river system in Northern California by sending our water to Southern California?	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the EIR/EIS discloses the potential water quality impacts resulting from constructing and operating the proposed project. See also Master Response 14 (Water Quality), Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).
5836	1	I'm against big agribusiness always trying to exploit our national resources and hurting us and the environment in the process!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
5837	1	This is not the way to solve California's water issues.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5838	1	I live on the Delta and want to preserve what I grew up knowing!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5839	1	This is a bad plan. It's taking out water and going south with the water rights. Poor	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		planning.	nor include any regulatory actions that would affect water rights holders other than DWR, Reclamation, and SWP and CVP contractors. Importantly, all water exported by the SWP and CVP is subject to the existing water rights of those two agencies. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives analyzed in the EIR/EIS only include the use of water from existing SWP and CVP water rights or voluntary water transfers from other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders.
5840	1	This is a fundamentally bad idea and a terrible waste of taxpayer dollars.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Refer to Master Response 5 (Funding).
5841	1	Protect and preserve the Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5842	1	I oppose this.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5843	1	I oppose the Delta tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5844	1	Draining the water is a bad idea. It's a short-sighted quick fix that will destroy the ecosystem of that area. California needs to look to within its borders to rearrange its infrastructures to allow the rain to drain into the ground instead of running off into concrete drains. If these issues would have been met head-on back in the 70s when people first complained about the poor drainage systems, too much land was paved over, perhaps California would not be in this fix. But you can't destroy all the surrounding ecosystems as a last-ditch effort.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The proposed project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports). 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.
5845	1	It's environmentally irresponsible to build these tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5846	1	I want to protect our estuaries and our water.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5847	1	Tunnels will kill the Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5848	1	I live on the water and want to preserve the Delta for future generations. This destructive action will even harm the San Francisco Bay as it will no longer flush it out properly. The cost alone will bankrupt the state. If the dollars should be spent at all, it should be on desalination in the Los Angeles area.	Impacts on Delta outflows (fresh water flowing to the Bay) are not significant. Model simulation results for the preferred alternative (4A) indicate that long-term average and wet year peak outflows would increase in winter months with a corresponding decrease in spring months because of the shift in system inflows caused by climate change and increased Delta exports as compared to Existing Conditions. In other year types, Alternative 4A would result in higher or similar outflow because of the spring outflow requirements. In summer and fall months, Alternative 4A would result in similar or higher outflow because of changes in export patterns and OMR flow requirements and export reductions in fall months, and also because of the Fall X2 requirements in wet and above normal years. The incremental changes in Delta outflow between Alternative 4A and Existing Conditions would be a function of both the facility and operations assumptions

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>(including north Delta intakes capacity of 9,000 cfs, less negative OMR flow requirements, enhanced spring outflow and/or Fall X2 requirements) and the reduction in water supply availability due to increased north of Delta urban demands, sea level rise and climate change. Results for the range of changes in Delta Outflow under Alternative 4A are presented in more detail in Appendix 5A, BDCP EIR/S Modeling Technical Appendix, of the Draft EIR/EIS.</p> <p>For a more detailed response regarding impacts beneficial uses of water, please see Master Response 34. Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project, including reverse flows and salinity. Please also refer to Master Responses 26 regarding changes in Delta exports, 5 regarding costs and implementation, and 7 regarding desalination.</p>
5849	1	I feel that we still need our local wildlife and our one water ecosystem.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5850	1	The Delta is important to all of the state and the tunnels will ruin it.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5851	1	I live near the North Delta and my passion is spending time on the islands and water of the Delta. Our wildlife, recreation economy will take a serious hit if the tunnels are built. There are much more economical and less environmentally impacting options.	On-water recreation such as fishing and boating would still be accessible throughout the Delta during and after construction of the proposed project. Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need.
5852	1	We need more storage and not stealing water from one region and giving it to another.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 37 (Water Storage).
5853	1	I oppose the Delta tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5854	1	I am opposed to the tunnels!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5855	1	I believe the tunnels are not worth the damage!	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.
5856	1	Save the Delta, please.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5857	1	It won't improve the Delta on which we all depend.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5858	1	Keep the Delta alive! Stop the tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5859	1	Humans have already done enough damage to this earth! Build your salt water purifying machines or wait for rain! Leave the Delta and estuaries to what they are	<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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		now and not harm it worse!	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 63 (Desalination).
5860	1	This is my [expletive deleted] Delta and where is everyone else when we need help?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5861	1	To protect wildlife and encourage more innovative, small scale solutions to water distribution and conservation.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5862	1	The same reason to reject the Peripheral Canal project is yet more urgent now with the drought and empty aquifers.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 36 (Peripheral Canal).
5863	1	The Delta needs its water!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5864	1	These tunnels will destroy the Delta and for what? So Southern California can keep their lawns green? I am sure the cost will be astronomical and it does nothing to bring new water sources into California! How about a tunnel from Canada, they have tons of water!	<p>A tunnel to transport water from Canada is beyond the scope of the BDCP and California WaterFix. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3. For more information regarding the development of alternatives please see Master Response 4.</p>
5865	1	I oppose the destruction of California's unique Delta system by Jerry Brown in order to enable run-away population growth in a drought stricken state.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5866	1	The tunnels will ruin the Delta!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5867	1	Every one of us will be affected in some way by the tunnel proposal.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5868	1	As a concerned Californian, water and the environment is an important factor why I live here. The changes in our natural water sources and increasing the farming in arid land that should not be farmed is changing the balance in out water and our environment. I support looking at solutions that will solve problems and not add problems.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/.</p> <p>By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns while securing reliable water deliveries. Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p>
5869	1	I think the tunnels would be a giant boondoggle that will destroy the Delta, besides costing an obscenely large amount. Deciding on mitigation after the damage is done because nobody knows what to do now and do not want to admit to the likely costs, could mean the Delta would never recover.	<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. Resource areas are addressed separately under sections of the EIR/EIS for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding).</p>
5870	1	The continuing siphoning of northern waters for the Central Valley and Southern California does not solve the water problem for all Californians. More creative approaches and factors that affect our environment must be considered and undertaken to solve the water shortage on the long term.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change with continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).</p>
5871	1	Northern California cannot afford this damage to our Delta and habitats.	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5872	1	I am concerned about the amount of water and its quality if the tunnels move our Bay water to the south, They have had many inches of rain last month while Northern California did not. Where is all their rainwater? Make their rainwater serve the Southern California need for water. Do not remove ours through the tunnels.	<p>It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project. Rather, the scope and purpose of the proposed project is much more limited. As explained in Chapter 2 Project Objectives and Purpose and Need of the Final EIR/EIS, the fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the State Water Project (SWP) system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and Central Valley Project (CVP) south-of-Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework with statutory and contractual obligations. Please see Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need of the proposed project.</p> <p>Additional water storage was eliminated from consideration in the Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS through the alternatives development and screening process (discussed in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives). As such, the proposed project does not propose storage as a project component. Although the proposed project would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, Alternative 4A is a stand-alone project which demonstrates independent utility just as future storage projects would demonstrate. Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives) and Master Response 37 (Storage) for additional information.</p> <p>The plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Although the project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented California Waterfix project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports) for further information.</p>
5873	1	I do not think it is a good idea to create tunnels to ship water over long distance without understanding the consequence of environmental impact. This huge project is also very expensive and will have significant impact to the state budget. I believe that we need to get the consensus of California voters with the detail of the environmental, economical and public health impact fully revealed.	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Chapter 32 of the Final EIR/EIS and Master Response 40 for information regarding outreach conducted for California WaterFix (and previously the BDCP). More information on how DWR has developed the project in an open and transparent manner is provided in Master Response 41.</p>
5874	1	Tunneling the Delta and diverting water is not a sustainable choice. The Delta is a thriving ecosystem which cannot take the burden of maintaining itself with less water. The habitat and animals will suffer. This is not the answer to the problem and will cause more harm to an already strained and fragile Delta.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
5875	1	Humans are not the only creatures that need water.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5876	1	It is important to preserve our environment. It sustains life. May I suggest	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		desalination? San Francisco is foggy. Look into water harvesting technology.	continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project. Rather, the scope and purpose of the proposed project is much more limited. As explained in Chapter 2 Project Objectives and Purpose and Need of the Final EIR/EIS, the fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the State Water Project (SWP) system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and Central Valley Project (CVP) south-of-Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework with statutory and contractual obligations. Please see Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need of the proposed project. Please also refer to Master Response 7 for additional information on why desalination was eliminated from the alternatives development and screening process.
5877	1	I care about the Delta and want it preserved!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5878	1	We can come up with a more cost-effective, less pervasive intrusion into our Delta ecosystem.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 4 (Alternatives).
5879	1	I grew up on the Delta and want to preserve its natural beauty.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5880	1	I believe the Delta must be saved. This is not going to happen with this type of legislation!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5881	1	I am favor for the Delta region to survive.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5882	1	This will have vast negative effects on the Delta and our area.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5883	1	We need to stop screwing with nature!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5884	1	I do not see any use in moving water to the south where there are no reservoirs and they let the rain water run unto the sea instead of catching it. Southern California groups say that they can recycle water appropriately if there is a will. With northern waters freely given there is no will. Let's toughen up the south and show them they can do it.	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. Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.
5885	1	I support the preservation of the rich farmland surrounding the Delta and the preservation of the Delta as a watershed. The many estuaries are an invaluable resource to the beauty and preservation of the rich farmland surrounding the Delta	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		and the preservation of the Delta as a watershed. The many estuaries are an invaluable resource to the beauty and preservation of the state of California. We need to focus on conservation for the next 100 years, and allowing the tunnels to be built so folks can grow crops in the desert or sell the water for profit is a poor excuse for this project. If the farmers in Kern County want a dam, then they should a dam in Kern County.	<p>circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> <p>Impacts to agriculture are identified and discussed in Chapter 14; Lead Agencies have proposed measures that would support and protect agricultural production in the Delta by securing agricultural easements and/or by seeking opportunities to protect and enhance agriculture with a focus on maintaining economic activity on agricultural lands. See Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation).</p>
5886	1	I believe the tunnel project will be environmentally and economically damaging to the Delta region as well as being significantly more costly than projected. Restore the Delta, do not destroy it. And look at alternative ways to address state water issues.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding), Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 4 (Alternatives) and Master Response 6 (Demand Management).
5887	1	We need to save our waterways because we need our fresh water. The Governor is doing a lot of changes behind our backs.	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.
5888	1	I see the aqueduct full every time we drive by, but at the same time I see fields of farmers bare and dry or no crops at all. Farm land sold to developers. Who is going to grow our food in the future for our kids and grandkids if we let the government keep taking our water?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. In its efforts to achieve the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration, the California WaterFix seeks to protect dozens of species of fish and wildlife in the Delta while also securing reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California. Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed California WaterFix.
5889	1	The WaterFix is a waste of money and going to ruin 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. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5890	1	Our habitat is very important to me.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5891	1	You cannot send all our water south. They waste more water. There is a desert with lawns.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. No further response is required.
5892	1	[The WaterFix] is a disaster for the Delta ecosystem. We cannot play God and expect it to be an innocuous change.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5893	1	I grew up on the Delta. This plan to provide tunnels will only hurt the Delta. The only way nature survives is by running it is own course. Every time man steps in we ruin it despite good/bad intentions.	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.
5894	1	I believe these tunnels will destroy our Delta. Salt water will intude and ruin farming in this area.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
5895	1	The tunnels will ruin the Delta. The State will not protect the Delta once the tunnel are built.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5896	1	As a kayaker I have become more aware of the importance of our precious Delta water.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5897	1	I am so sick of Southern California sucking water from everybody. They should not allow growth that cannot be supported by local water. Leave the San Francisco Bay-Delta alone!	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. 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.
5898	1	This is a very bad idea that will destroy the Delta and Bay.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5899	1	The tunnels are bad for all Californians. It will kill the Delta and make the land useless. Southern California Can make a new agreement with Arizona and get water from them like they did before.	Operation of the project water delivery system could not drain the Delta rivers and channels dry, including the Sacramento River. The project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. 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. Deliveries to

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>in-Delta senior water rights users are the same under the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and all action alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS in accordance with existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. 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/S. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html).</p> <p>Considerations of adverse impacts to agricultural water users due to implementation of the action alternatives (not climate change, sea level rise, or projected population growth that would have occurred with or without the proposed project) are discussed in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources. Changes in Delta water quality that could affect agricultural water users are discussed in Chapter 8, Water Quality, including changes in bromide, chloride, and electrical conductivity.</p> <p>The Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, Proposed Project, and action alternatives include the assumption that the maximum amount of water supplies from the Colorado River to be used by the southern California water entities. No additional water supplies from the Colorado River would be available for SWP water users. The Proposed Project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).</p>
5900	1	I strongly oppose the twin tunnels. The fragile Delta cannot afford to have so much water funneled off to go down south. Salt levels are already an issue in the Delta waterways. Siphoning off more water will surely have devastating effects on the Delta, farmers, and communities. I vote no to the tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The preferred alternative, Alternative 4A, 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 preferred alternative would be almost the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the preferred alternative).
5901	1	As an ecologist, I see far too many problems with this project. We can find a better alternative.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5902	1	We need our water to sustain the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5903	1	The tunnels are a threat to Northern California agriculture and fishing.	The issue raised 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Resource areas are addressed separately in the EIR/EIS under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments and mitigation measures will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).
5904	1	I care about the planet. We need a sustainable environment and this certainly points us the opposite direction.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5905	1	This is a very bad idea.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5906	1	The tunnel project is an extraordinarily large and expensive project which solves no problem and creates many. The project is also destructive and discriminatory to Northern California. Why is that ok?	The issue raised 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. Resource areas are addressed separately in the EIR/EIS under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments and mitigation measures will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports), and Master Response 5 (Cost)
5907	1	[I care about] the potential environmental and economic impacts to Northern California.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5908	1	I do not want the Delta to be destroyed!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5909	1	I agree that the tunnels should not be built.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5910	1	I am against this because of the damage that will happen to the Delta. By the way I am totally disgusted with the attempt to go around the decision of the people. We already said no to the cancel.	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.
5911	1	This is insane. It will destroy the resources for life for not only California, but have other far reaching consequences. Must be stopped. Remember what happened with Owens Valley Water!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The proposed project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports). 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.
5912	1	The Tunnels is just a water grab by West Side Farmers and Metropolitan Water District.	As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5913	1	Tunnels will cause salt water intrusion by reducing fresh water flush.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
5914	1	Stop destroying the environment and diverting water to southern California. This project does not or provide the claimed environmental benefit. The Delta is already impacted enough without diverting freshwater. This project is a waste of money. Southern California should learn to conserve water like the rest of California before the entire state pays to divert more water. No tunnels.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports), Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply), and Master Response 6 (Demand Management).
5915	1	I oppose the transport of our Sacramento River water to Los Angeles. The money could be better spent expanding their water storage. On a recent trip, no one there seems to be conserving water, they do not even seem to know we are in a fourth year draught. Why destroy a healthy eco system in central California. For Southern California, who do not even seem to conserve? They have all the money and available land to expand their storage capacity! Leave the Sacramento River system alone!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. For information regarding why water storage was not included in the proposed project, refer to Master Response 37 (Water Storage) and Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 34 for additional details on the determination of beneficial use.
5916	1	I think there are less destructive way for the Los Angeles area to get water. They need to stop depending on the northern California water, which is not in good shape to begin with, and develop better means in their own area. Desalination or water recovery (maybe some of the water that's being dumped back into the ocean for no good reason)	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
5917	1	It is bad for the Delta there is better ways to get water to the south.	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. 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.
5918	1	We need more water storage and desalination plants. Moving a limited resource from one place to another does nothing to increase the amount of water available.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. For information regarding why water storage was not included in the proposed project, refer to Master Response 37 (Water Storage) and Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 7 for information on desalination and why it was not included as a project alternative.
5919	1	The water in the Delta supports the fish and birds. It also supplies the farming industry.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5920	1	Any further action to reduce water flowing through the Delta further damages the quality of water, land, and life of all living things in the Delta.	All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Resources Control Board on the Sacramento river with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The project considered in the EIR/EIS would not affect water operations on the Tuolumne River or water supplies for the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The State Water Resources Control Board, not DWR and Reclamation, is responsible for decisions relating to water rights. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information regarding changes in delta exports please see Master Response 26. 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. Considerations of adverse impacts to Delta water users due to implementation of the action alternatives (not climate change, sea level rise, or projected population growth that would have occurred with or without the proposed project) are discussed in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, and Chapter 20, Public Services and Utilities. Changes in Delta water quality that could affect Delta water users are discussed in Chapter 8, Water Quality, including changes in bromide, chloride, and electrical conductivity.
5921	1	The WaterFix is no fix at all - it makes absolutely no economic or environmental sense.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding).
5922	1	At this stage in the game agriculture needs to reform its farming and water usage. Why do we need to grow things for other countries. What happens in couple years when we	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		have no water left?	uses of water delivered via proposed conveyance facilities.
5923	1	The southland needs to lower the levels of their reservoirs, so when it rains all the runoff does not go into the ocean!	<p>Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p>
5924	1	I want to protect the water sources for the Stockton and San Joaquin County County area. The Delta is a natural resource that should be protected. Destroying one part of the state to support another is irrational and should not even be considered.	All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641). The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.
5925	1	We need to invest in local infrastructure to capture rainwater and to reuse and refill our wastewater. This is especially true in light of El Nino -- we will get more rain this winter than we have seen in a long time and we should be trying to capture as much as possible. We should retire the acidified topsoils on which almonds are produced and replace those areas with massive solar farms, which would be more profitable and help California transition away from the fossil fuels that are trying to be fracked in the Central Valley with water from the two proposed tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.
5925	1	I oppose the Twin Tunnels, because I want to keep water for the Delta for our many water uses including our agricultural needs.	<p>The proposed project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies needed to meet California's overall water management needs. It is not a substitute for increased commitments to other water supply solutions, including recycling, desalination, water conservation and storage. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management and Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives.</p> <p>The Lead Agencies do not have land use planning authorities (such as changing local land uses and zoning ordinances or controlling what crops should be planted).</p> <p>Regarding water use, the proposed project does not make determinations regarding how water delivered through the proposed project conveyance or other water conveyance facility will be put to a beneficial use. The State Water Resources Control Board is charged with the comprehensive planning and allocation of water resources in California. Please refer to Master Response 34 for additional details on beneficial use.</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 stipulated beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural,</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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. As of the present, hydraulic fracturing is a lawful use of water, as state law generally permits oil and gas operators to engage in “the injection of air, gas, water, or other fluids into the productive strata, the application of pressure heat or other means for the reduction of viscosity of the hydrocarbons, the supplying of additional motive force, or the creating of enlarged or new channels for the underground movement of hydrocarbons into production wells[.]” (Cal. Pub. Resources Code, § 3106[b].)</p> <p>The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) could modify water permits to balance and protect beneficial uses of water. If the Legislature declared fracking to be unreasonable, it would potentially trigger the SWRCB to revise water right permits in such a way as to restrict Delta water from being used for fracking.</p>
5925	2	We should invest in the levees that protect the San Joaquin River Delta from saltwater inundation! As climate disruption continues and sea levels rise, we must protect this massive freshwater supply from the oceans.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS.
5926	1	Save the Sacramento, Mc Cloud and Pitt Rivers. Los Angeles does not need more water just less people.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised. The proposed project is just one element of the state’s long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.
5927	1	To protect the Delta and our fresh water from irresponsible and nonsensical profiteering, using more of our Delta water to grow water intensive almonds and pistachios on unsustainable desert soils.	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.
5928	1	This is a waste of taxpayers money. It does not add any additional water.	<p>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 address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in surface water and groundwater storage, agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).</p>
5930	1	I am signing because I oppose to the Delta Tunnels plan.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5931	1	Remember Owens Valley. Delta tunnels are worse than that with zero gain to life and living.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The proposed project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports). 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.
5932	1	I am opposed, this is a bad deal all the way around.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Governor Brown should focus on shutting down the current/ongoing Climate Engineering operations in our skies which have caused these droughts.</p> <p>You can't expect Californians to watch out skies being filled with Aerosol GeoEngineering pushing storm systems north and south of us, meanwhile blaming "us" for climate change.</p> <p>It is BS, we the people will no longer tolerate these issues or sit quite allowing them to happen.</p>	
5933	1	I am opposing the tunnels because the same political entities who have exerted enough clout to get this project this far, will have the clout to turn the Delta into a waste land. We cannot turn our backs on the Delta.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5934	1	The Delta needs more freshwater flows, not more diversions. The tunnels would be the nail in the coffin for this magnificent estuary that's already struggling due to excess pumping.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>The range of alternatives in the EIR/EIS includes alternatives which result in reductions in SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta as compared to the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative and Alternatives 4H1, 4H2, 4H3, 4H4; 5; 6A, 6B, 6C; 7; 8; and 9 would result in less SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta than under Existing Conditions (shown in Tables 5-5 and 5-8). Similarly, Alternatives 6A, 6B, 6C; 7; 8; and 9 would result in less SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta than under the No Action Alternative (shown in Tables 5-6 and 5-9). However, SWP and CVP water deliveries would continue under all alternatives.</p>
5935	1	With climate change, there are no guarantees that there will be enough water for both central and southern California. The governor should be looking at options that allow the southern part of the state to be self-sufficient, whether it's with desalination or purified gray water.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies needed to meet California's overall water management needs. It is not a substitute for increased commitments to other water supply solutions, including recycling, desalination, water conservation and storage. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management and Master Response 7 for information on desalination and why it was not included as a project alternative.
5936	1	The Delta is a unique, precious and fragile resource. The tunnels would destroy a significant portion of this natural resource. The Delta must be protected. It can never be replaced.	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.
5937	1	I live next to the water you want to steal and I fish and recreate on this water you want to steal. It is not good to steal. Governor Brown, back off our water.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).
5938	1	Water policy in California needs to be completely re-examined. The environment is changing and old-style "fixes" are damaging and won't work.	The California Water Fix is just one project as part of the much larger California Water Action Plan. The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information please see: http://resources.ca.gov/docs/california_water_action_plan/Final_California_Water_Action_Plan.pdf
5939	1	I don't believe this is the correct way to address the problem, and I believe it will do irreversible damage to our Delta's ecosystem.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. The project would include avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures to mitigate the project's effects on sensitive biological resources. Chapter 11 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses measures to protect aquatic ecosystems, and Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses measures to protect terrestrial ecosystems.
5940	1	I want to save the Delta and preserve the fishery for the future.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5941	1	I care about the Delta, and the species that depend on the historical quality of water.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
5942	2	I believe the tunnels will destroy the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5943	1	What they are trying to do is not in the best interest of the people of California.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5944	1	I strongly oppose these wasteful tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5945	1	I live in the Delta and I know what kind of damage this will do to the area.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
5946	1	I am opposed to the twin tunnels. Too expensive, won't solve the problem, and risks the health of the Delta.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5(Cost and Funding).
5947	1	We need the Delta!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5948	1	The tunnels will destroy the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5949	1	There is no water to send. Look to other alternatives.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. The project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change with continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management).</p>
5950	1	This [the WaterFix] is a bad plan which does nothing to add to our water reserves. We need new reservoirs to store water during wet years, expanded recycled water programs, and a serious commitment to desalinization.	<p>It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project. Rather, the scope and purpose of the proposed project is much more limited. As explained in Chapter 2 Project Objectives and Purpose and Need of the Final EIR/EIS, the fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the State Water Project (SWP) system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and Central Valley Project (CVP) south-of-Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework with statutory and contractual obligations. Please see Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the proposed project.</p> <p>Additional water storage was eliminated from consideration in the Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS through the alternatives development and screening process (discussed in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives). As such, the proposed project does not propose storage as a project component. Although the proposed project would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, Alternative 4A is a stand-alone project which demonstrates independent utility just as future storage projects would demonstrate. Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives) and Master Response 37 (Storage) for additional information.</p> <p>Please also refer to Master Response 7 for additional information on why desalination was eliminated from</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			the alternatives development and screening process.
5951	1	This is not a fix for the Delta, it's a death nail. I oppose the tunnels and the ensuing damage and harm that will come from their construction. I believe this is a water grab and not something with the Delta's best interests in mind.	<p>Please note that the project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole. Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>Since the late 1800s, the Bay-Delta ecosystem has been substantially altered. Changes in key environmental attributes of the Bay-Delta have contributed to the current degraded state of the ecosystem and appear to be proximate causes of declines in desired fishes and increases in non-native species. California WaterFix is not intended to address all the factors that have contributed to the Delta's decline and briefly summarizes a few but not all of those factors. Many factors that have contributed to the decline of the Delta's ecosystem including the conversion of tidal marsh and floodplains to farmland, construction of levees and altering of tide flows, in-Delta and upstream water diversions, contaminant discharges, ammonia and nutrient discharges and changes to the food web, increases in water temperatures, and introduction of non-native and invasive species. The Delta will remain in a highly altered state for the foreseeable future and the project is not intended to address all the past harms or restore the Delta to a pre-altered state.</p> <p>The project would help to address the resilience and adaptability of the Delta to climate change through water delivery facilities combined with a range of operational flexibility. In addition to the added water management flexibility created by new water diversions and operational scenarios, the project would improve habitat, increase food supplies and reduce the effects of other stressors on the Delta ecosystem.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Responses 31 (Delta Reform Act), Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports), Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>
5952	1	Because I care about the water in my county.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5953	1	I do not want the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5954	1	The tunnels make no sense. We are in a drought and our Delta is dying right before our eyes. There is no way that stealing our water will help our waterways.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The proposed project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports). 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.
5955	1	My family's home may be in the path of the tunnels. The tunnels will not increase the supply of fresh water for California. We need resevoirs not tunnels!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			that depend on the Delta.
5956	1	This is a really ludicrous idea! Talk about building a better mouse trap. You cannot improve this ecosystem with tunnels. As one with a degree in Environmental Studies, this makes no sense.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5957	1	I oppose the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5958	1	I am signing because I am opposed to the Delta tunnels because the benefits do not match the cost. According to Dr. Jeffrey Michael, University of the Pacific, the estimated benefits for the project drop by \$10 billion without regulatory assurance for water deliveries so that costs exceed benefits by at least \$8 billion. The costs will be borne by farmers and urban ratepayers. Since there is no added water, urban ratepayers obtain no benefit.	Please see Master Response 5 regarding costs of implementation. Additionally, DWR is revising the Socioeconomic Impact Analysis for the project based on changes included in the RDEIR/SDEIS. For more information regarding funding sources please see Master Response 5.
5959	1	I oppose the Delta tunnels/California WaterFix (Alternative 4A) because it benefits big business and not the masses at the expense of the taxpayers, environment and public health.	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. For more information regarding impacts to public health please see Chapter 25 of the FEIR/EIS.
5960	1	This is an expensive project that we do not need, will not solve the upstream pollution problems--but will actually worsen them--will perpetuate unsustainable ag practices and decimate the Delta habitat and ecology. We have better solutions available. Let's use them instead.	Providing regulatory oversight to agribusinesses is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. The proposed project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies needed to meet California's overall water management needs. It is not a substitute for increased commitments to other water supply solutions, including recycling, desalination, water conservation and storage. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management and Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives. Also, please see Master Response 3 for information on the project purpose and need.
5961	1	The tunnel construction would jeopardize a very special ecosystem that is biologically and economically critical to the surrounding region. The water interests from the south have proven they would sacrifice anything to get more water. Currently, they are pumping their aquifers dry that supply their cities. Would they care at all about a place 100 miles or more away?	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply), and Master Response 6 (Demand Management).
5962	1	[I am] a strong opponent of the Delta tunnels water grab. I live in Discovery Bay and bought my home here for fresh water boating and fear the impact on my lifestyle and property values will be grave. The California WaterFix does not address the environmental, public health or economic impacts of the proposed Delta tunnels project. Also, the plan ignores alternatives that would save California tax and ratepayers billions of dollars while investing in the jobs and local water sources that build sustainability.	<p>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, Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage.
5963	1	Stop the tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5964	1	I have a home on the Delta and do not want to see it devastated by Brown's Water Grab.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5965	1	The tunnels will neither fix nor eradicate the water problems for California; they will only exacerbate them!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5966	1	I am signing because more Southern California development and more agribusiness at the expense of losing the Delta is not the right thing to do.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.
5967	1	We lived in the Delta for 17 years. I feel that this plan would only harm the area by not allowing enough water to keep the salt water from intruding and increase the pollution due to lack of water to dilute any harmful agents in the water.	Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the EIR/EIS discloses the potential water quality impacts resulting from constructing and operating the proposed project. See also Master Response 14 (Water Quality).
5967	2	The potential costs are enormous and will only add to the already burdensome tax rate.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5968	1	I do not want tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5969	1	I oppose the tunnels. Costs too much. It will destroy the Delta and destroy the farming in Northern California. No on tunnels.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation).
5970	1	Building the tunnels won't create more water, it will just create a larger demand for water. Our North Coast rivers are experiencing a very bad drought and are barely able to support habitat for fish. We cannot afford to export any more!	<p>The Proposed Project and action alternatives would not affect North Coast rivers as compared to the No Action Alternative. However, flows in all rivers and streams in California would be affected by climate change in the future with or without the proposed project or action alternatives.</p> <p>In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The proposed project conveyance facilities would not be operational until 2025, at which time, the increased water demands would have occurred in accordance with the published urban water management plans and agricultural water management plans for entities that use SWP or CVP water. The same growth would occur under the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Project, and all of the action alternatives.</p>
5971	1	I grew up in the Delta and have noticed the recent changes that the climate has taken on our agriculture. If the tunnels are built then what would happen to our agriculture? We will have to start importing, creating higher unemployment rates in California.	Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, provides impact analyses regarding conversion of Important Farmland and farmland under Williamson Act contracts or in Farmland Security Zones, on a temporary, short-term, or permanent basis, due to implementation of Alternatives 1A-9 and 4A, 2D and 5A.). Effects on individual crop types were calculated and are presented in Appendix 14A, Individual Crop Effects as a Result of BDCP Water Conveyance Facility Construction. However, their evaluation is incorporated in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics (Impacts ECON-6, ECON-12, and ECON-18) because changes in crop selection and crop yield are considered primarily economic effects, rather than changes to the physical environment.
5972	1	This project is awful for California!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5973	1	I want to save the San Francisco Bay-Delta from the damage that will be caused to it by the proposed tunnels. Also, our farm is in the above-referenced Delta and will be adversely affected by the proposed tunnels. Please do not build the tunnels!	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> <p>Impacts to agriculture are identified and discussed in Chapter 14; Lead Agencies have proposed measures that would support and protect agricultural production in the Delta by securing agricultural easements and/or by seeking opportunities to protect and enhance agriculture with a focus on maintaining economic activity on agricultural lands. See Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation).</p>
5974	1	I object to the Delta tunnels because of the risks to environment. Surely, there are better ways to cope with California drought. Why not move forward on the other water projects? You will help relieve draught and furnish much needed employment, too.	<p>It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 (Demand Management) for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>The scope and purpose of the proposed project is much more limited. As explained in Chapter 2 Project Objectives and Purpose and Need of the Final EIR/EIS, the fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the State Water Project (SWP) system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and Central Valley Project (CVP) south-of-Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework with statutory and contractual</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>obligations.</p> <p>The California WaterFix (referred to in the FEIR/FEIS as Alternative 4A) is DWR's preferred alternative under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Reclamation's preferred alternative under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Alternative 4A addresses the reverse flow problem by focusing on the construction and operation of new north Delta intakes and on habitat restoration commensurate with the footprint of these new facilities. The construction and operation of new conveyance facilities would help resolve many of the concerns with the current south Delta conveyance system while otherwise helping to reduce threats to endangered and threatened species in the Delta through habitat restoration, as necessary to mitigate significant environmental effects and satisfy applicable ESA and CESA standards. Implementing a dual conveyance system, in which water could be diverted from either the north or the south or both, depending on the needs of aquatic organisms, would align water operations to better reflect natural seasonal flow patterns by creating new water diversions in the north Delta equipped with state-of-the-art fish screens. The new system would reduce the ongoing physical impacts associated with sole reliance on the southern diversion facilities and allow for greater operational flexibility to better protect fish. Minimizing south Delta pumping would provide more natural east–west flow patterns. The new diversions would also help protect critical water supplies against the threats of sea level rise and earthquakes. Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional information regarding purpose and need.</p> <p>Chapter 16 of the RDEIR/SDEIS, Socioeconomics, addresses the beneficial effect the project would have because of construction-related and water conveyance facilities labor forces.</p>
5975	1	I boat and fish the Delta and don't believe this already fragile ecosystem can lose the water proposed for the diversion tunnels without devastating consequences to fish and salinity to fresh water!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports) and Master Response 14 (Salinity).
5976	1	I'm signing [the petition] because this is not a good thing for our part of California between the farmers that are struggling for water to grow food and fish that are using the waterways.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5977	1	In 2005 I voted against propositions that sold private bonds at tax payers expense to build more water infrastructure for our state because the options explored like dams and Delta tunnels are not the best option for California. We are in this drought because industry has taken advantage of resources way too long without any compensation or responsibility in the matter, and we cannot change the face of our state forever because of a temporary problem that is not caused locally. Please don't damage our state anymore.	By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The proposed project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be almost the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 44 (Changes in Delta Exports). Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 6 (Demand Management) and Master Response 4 (Alternatives).
5978	1	I care about the environment especially the fisheries. This plan, if implemented, will be viewed by historians down the line as a catastrophe.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			operational flexibility.
5979	1	I'm opposed to this waste of money and water and I feel like what the people say has no effect. But I will try!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5980	1	Want to save the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5981	1	I oppose the Delta tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5982	1	No tunnels! The Central Valley needs our water to support the farmers and wine growers in the valley! Without water in the Central Valley our crops and vineyards will perish!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5983	1	I want to stop the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5984	1	I oppose the Delta tunnels and will fight it based on endangered species and economic cost.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding).
5985	1	The Delta should be protected and remain the beautiful sanctuary it is!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5986	1	This plan is fundamentally unfair, too costly, would not provide either water reliability or enhance/protect the Delta, and does not consider less costly and more environmentally responsible alternatives.	<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 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/.</p> <p>By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns while securing reliable water deliveries. Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding).</p>
5987	1	I oppose the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5988	1	The tunnels will not create more water. They are expensive and destructive. We have to protect our natural resources instead of being pressured by corporations and private interests looking to profit from the tunnels.	By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
5989	1	I'm signing [the petition] due to environmental, public health, and economic concerns.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
5990	1	Those people need to do a better job with the water they have, not get more to waste more.	<p>Although conservation components, water storage, and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p>
5991	1	I opposed the Peripheral Canal scheme put forth under Brown 1 and I oppose this one for the same reason. It's nothing but a Los Angeles/Owens Valley water theft plot. At least it's in the open so we can at least make an effort to stop it.	<p>The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor include any regulatory actions that would affect water rights holders other than DWR, Reclamation, and SWP and CVP contractors.</p> <p>Importantly, all water exported by the SWP and CVP is subject to the existing water rights of those two agencies. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives analyzed in the EIR/EIS only include the use of water from existing SWP and CVP water rights or voluntary water transfers from other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders.</p> <p>The proposed project's facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants, would be operated in accordance with permits issued by, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the State Water Resources Control Board, among other agencies. The proposed project would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards.</p> <p>Through the Legislature and through executive agencies, California has embraced water conservation on numerous fronts, as have many California water agencies. Many of these efforts are highlighted in Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, which describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply, including recycled water. While these elements are not proposed as part of the project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. 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>For more information regarding alternatives development, water demand management, and purpose and need please see Master Response 4, Master Response 6, and Master Response 3. For more information regarding the peripheral canal, see Master Response 36.</p>
5992	1	I'm totally against it!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
5993	1	We don't have enough water right now. I don't want to see the Delta become saltwater. I believe the farmers need what little water we have to grow crops. We had so little water the salmon couldn't get down the river. We had to truck the salmon down the river so they could get to the ocean. Now how do we benefit by building tunnels?	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
5994	1	Love the rivers, this will hurt.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5995	1	This plan is flawed in so many ways and most of all, it threatens the integrity of the Delta and our way of life for those who live along it.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).
5996	1	Enough water is already being diverted. As the climate changes and California becomes drier, these tunnels will do even more damage. Instead, we need to transition away from unsustainable, water intensive crops to a more sound food source. The economy depends on it!	<p>The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of a particular water supply augmentation approach (greater agricultural conservation) and does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the proposed project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>For more information regarding agricultural beneficial water use please see Master Response 34.</p>
5997	1	The tunnel plan is ridiculous!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5998	1	Protect the Delta estuary!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
5999	1	Grew up in the Delta, learned early that southern California will grab whatever they can get (USDA subsidies, Sierra river water, etc. from northern California. These interests and the construction companies that hope to overrun project budgets and create a great big boondoggle are the only interests that favor this project (except for the politicians sponsored by these interests)!	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.</p>