

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
6000	1	I don't want to ruin the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6001	1	The tunnels will destroy the waterways of the beautiful California Delta, which are rare and harbor precious wild life and numerous fish species, recreational boating (as originally designed to provide)...	The issue raised 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.
6002	1	This plan to divert water from the Sacramento River will decimate the Delta ecosystems for the benefit of big agribusiness.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
6003	1	This has always sounded like a short-sighted Wile Coyote/Acme solution to the water problem in California. Use that money to build desalination plants, or tell people they need to conserve.	The issue raised 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 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.
6004	1	The tunnels are a boondoggle! The Delta is already being destroyed with the existing demands of its water.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
6005	1	This concept is absurdly shortsighted and doesn't address the problem of over population in a desert. Southern California needs to desalinate.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 63. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
6006	1	Governor Brown wants to take water from county to the other. This is a natural source; let the people that built a city in the desert find another water source.	The way water currently moves in the Delta is not natural and was shaped by people. Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the need for the project and its goals. Please also refer to Master Response 26 regarding changes in Delta exports.
6007	1	Protecting the ecology of the Delta cannot be squashed by political gain and greed. These politicians' lack of public awareness and support is disgraceful.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6008	1	I want to keep my water!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6009	1	The tunnels are the wrong answer to the water problem, there are more viable solutions. Get back to the drawing board.	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.
6010	1	I want to see the Delta remain as is.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
6011	1	Seriously a waste of money. Mrs Fienstiens old man is already rich enough.	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.
6012	1	It is a waste of my tax money and more importantly it will destroy the Delta, also Southern California is getting more rain than we are they should build a manmade lake to store all that extra water.	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 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 cost and funding sources please see Master Response 5.</p>
6013	1	Imposing these tunnels interferes with the dynamics of many eco systems. It's time we appreciate, that what is and refrain from interfering with nature. Please use your innovations to work in favor of our planet.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
6014	1	Southern California does not deserve more 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. 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.
6015	1	I believe that the large water districts should [not] get more water via our tax dollars for their profit without paying their share. I have been fishing the San Francisco Bay and Delta since the early 1960s and I have seen the decline in not only the environment, but the fish and wildlife as well. They have been pumping water for decades and they do not need more than what they are getting now. We are in a drought, everyone is being asked to cut back, what makes the southern water districts, private and public, special? Destroying the San Francisco Bay-Delta estuary for money does not make sense to me.	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
		They have been asking for more water every year and it will not stop no matter how much they get.	<p>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 amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Over the long-term, the proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries in drier periods. Overall, the average annual Delta exports are less in Alternatives 2, 4 (H2, H3, H4), and 5 through 9 than under Existing Conditions, as shown in Figure 5-17 of Chapter 5, Water Supply, of the EIR/EIS.</p>
6016	1	The tunnels will destroy the fragile delta and livelihood of many. Figure out a different solution. Save our Delta waters!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6017	1	I oppose the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6018	1	I own a fishing tackle company, Outlaw Fishing Co. We fish these waters and stand behind this action to stop the tunnels 100%. It will harm the fish that migrate up the Delta to rivers for spawning, including white sturgeon, green sturgeon, steelhead, Chinook salmon, silver salmon, American shad, and so on.	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. Therefore, there would be no adverse effects to the coastal fishing industry due to the alternative.
6019	1	Stop the tunnels! The financial cost is high, \$62 billion of which the taxpayers will be responsible for without a vote. The project will take 20 years to complete and provides no new water. The environment, wildlife and people are already feeling the effects of a lack of and degradation of our water quality. And there are suggestions for more immediate ways to address the seriousness of our water issues. Please, stop this insane idea before it creates an environmental and financial disaster for California.	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 4 (Alternatives), Master Response 6 (Demand Management), and Master Response 5(Cost and Funding).</p>
6020	1	Better, more ecologically sound plans have been proposed. The tunnels will devastate an area containing some of the richest farm land in the world. Turning freshwater habitat into salt marsh is not an act of restoration.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</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> <p>Effects of the alternatives on salinity levels are described in Chapter 8, Water Quality. Modeling results indicate that the implementation of the water conveyance facilities may positively or adversely affect in-Delta water quality, depending on a number of factors including location, time of year, and hydrologic conditions. Potential effects associated with the project and alternatives, modeling results for the No Action</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
6021	1	Too much collateral damage. I would be in favor of water restrictions before taking on such a huge project. Our current water usage is unsustainable. Period.	<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>
6022	1	Just do not do it. Bad idea, bad timing, not fair to the residents, or the Delta itself.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6023	1	The tunnels will totally ruin and kill the Delta worse than Clifton Court Forebay and the water export out of the Delta does now. There is now way the Tunnels will help the Delta. Instead it is a power water grab by people and businesses that do not care about the impact to this precious resource.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria 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).
6024	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.
6025	1	It is inherently absurd to argue that diverting huge amounts of the natural flow of water into the Delta will improve the ecology of 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 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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
6026	1	I feel very strongly about maintaining the wellbeing of the Sacramento River, adjoining Delta, Carquinez Straits and San Francisco Bay. every life form in these and around these bodies of water rely heavily on them for a vast number of reasons. I fear and believe throwing any of these very fragile ecosystems out of balance, even in a minor way, could have severe negative consequences for all life in these areas, and beyond. We as humans have the ability to solve problems in many ways, wildlife have far greater limitations, and I do not want to be part of the destruction of any of the many species at risk by the proposed Tunnels/California Water Fix. There are better options for us.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria 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).
6027	1	I live in Stockton and our Delta is a part of my life. I row with the Stockton Rowing Club and it means so much to me to be able to enjoy nature right here. The Delta is an integral part of our economy also. California can do better than this tunnel plan - both for ecology and economically. Stop the tunnels- please do not submit to this myopic failure of an 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. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).
6028	1	Hay que proteger la bahia y el sistema de agua. [Translation via 'Google Translate,' We must protect the bay and water system.]	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6029	1	I oppose the shipping of more fresh water to Southern California. I believe that what has happened to the San Joaquin River will occur with the Sacramento River if the Delta Tunnels are built.	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.
6030	1	I am signing to stop the California WaterFfix which has [no] regard for the San Francisco bay estuary ecosystem. It will not solve the water problem and destroy a true gem of our country.	It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 (Demand Management) for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The 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. Please also refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
6031	1	An increase in supply is not the correct solution. Reductions in demand are the solution. I oppose the tunnels.	<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>
6032	1	I strongly oppose the water tunnels/California WaterFix. The State of California has not adequately explained why these tunnels are needed and why Californians should agree to a proposal which essentially sells the Sacramento River to a few water districts which will profit enormously from a natural resource which belongs to all Californians. And why should we agree to this monstrous building project that will ruin the largest inland estuary in North America and inclusive wildlife habitat, recreational areas, local farms, groundwater and burden California taxpayers for generations and will further deplete our water supply in a state that drought has become the norm? We need to maintain our present water distribution system with better science and regulation. The California WaterFix is not a fix, but it is a huge blunder of enormous proportion. We cannot afford to keep entertaining this foolish idea by the State of California. We have much more pressing and important matters to deal with. Let's fix our schools, roads, environment, and other infrastructure.	<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. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p> <p>Resource areas are addressed separately under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments and mitigation measures will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible.</p> <p>Refer to Master Response 26 (Change in Delta Exports), Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation), Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place), and Master Response 5.</p>
6033	1	I don't want to sacrifice the health of the ecosystem of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for the sake of rich farmers getting richer or the overpopulation of Southern California. The wildlife and waterways should not be given up or raped for the benefit of anyone, period.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6034	1	I want to save one of the world's great estuaries.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6035	1	The Delta is more important than big agriculture and developers.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6036	1	It is an enormous expense without producing a single drop of new water and further	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
		degrades the Delta.	<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 proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.</p> <p>The proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months and in drier years; and increase exports in the wet winter months in wetter years when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 5. 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>
6037	1	I oppose siphoning water from the Delta to support housing and farming development in southern California. Water has its limits, and they have been reached.	<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>
6038	1	The Bay Delta is a natural preserve that needs to be preserved.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6039	1	Please do not ruin the Delta and send Northern California's south.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			operational flexibility.
6040	1	I am signing because the proposed Delta tunnels are an excessively expensive fix to supply the south with more water. Instead of taking Delta water and ruining the natural environment, there should be more push on recycling wastewater, which is a more renewable and environmentally-friendly approach.	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The 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 (i.e. 2025 conditions without the Proposed Project). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p> <p>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 cost please see Master Response 5.</p>
6041	1	We need to preserve our natural wildlife within the Delta for our children and generations to come.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6042	1	Our water is scarce and precious, and the species that really on it can not survive with the tunnels.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
6043	1	I am opposed to this Tunnel Plan of yours. You have already seen that the majority of California voters oppose this too. What gives you the right to continue on with this plan?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6044	1	I want the Delta to remain the same for us that live in the Bay Area.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6045	1	You tried this years ago. It was called peripheral canal. Save the Delta not kill it. Too much water goes south now. No water saving going on in Southern California. Stop building swimming pools.	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. 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards. For more information regarding how the proposed project differs from the peripheral canal please see Master Response 36.
6046	1	This is the largest natural estuary on the west coast and, as such, must be protected. The effects of these tunnels, not to mention the impact of the long term construction. Would be irreparably devastating. A bad idea we will never recover from.	<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. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
6047	1	The project is environmentally unsound and the real costs proposed do not address the ultimate cost, both environmentally and financially.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria 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). Resource areas are addressed separately under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments and mitigation measures will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible.
6048	1	I do not want to see the Delta dry up.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
6049	1	This tunnel project does not benefit Californians at large - just a small group of corporate farms and water agencies. No water transfer project that affects Delta Flows should be completed until water allocation rights are figured out so that the Delta can stop being degraded.	Several issues raised by the commenter address the merits of the project and do not raise any specific issues related to the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. Please see the response to Letter 2567- 4 regarding water rights.
6050	1	I feel the Delta Tunnels will ruin what is left of the Delta. There are way better ideas out there to spend all that money.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 6 (Demand Management), and Master Response 4 (Alternatives).

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
6051	1	The tunnels will destroy the San Joaquin Valley way of life and its economy.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).
6052	1	I work in Rio Vista at a county park along the delta. The delta tunnels will destroy the wildlife and the ecosystem that we have worked so hard to preserve and protect. How do you choose to support one ecosystem over another? Governor Brown, you should be ashamed of yourself.	<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.</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>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. The Proposed Project is intended to provide a more reliable water supply, with diversions that are more protective for fish, in accordance with the Delta Reform Act co-equal goals of improving water supply reliability and Delta ecosystem health. Please see Master Response 31 regarding the Delta Reform Act.</p> <p>Please also see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project and Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place).</p>
6053	1	This project does not, on the whole, benefit Californians and its economy - it actually harms us all.	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. As described in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, under Alternative 4, Impact ECON-1, construction employment is estimated to peak at 2,427 FTE jobs in year 3. Total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) would peak in year 12, at 8,673 FTE jobs. Direct agricultural employment would be reduced by an estimated 16 FTE jobs, while total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) associated with agricultural employment would fall by 57 FTE jobs. Because construction of water conveyance facilities would result in an increase in construction-related employment and labor income, this would be considered a beneficial effect.</p>
6054	1	My wife works in Rio Vista and helps support and maintain the delta ecosystem. Everything she's done to support the wildlife up until this point will be for nothing. Stop the tunnels and stop this madness.	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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. The Proposed Project is intended to provide a more reliable water supply, with diversions that are more protective for fish, in accordance with the Delta Reform Act co-equal goals of improving water supply reliability and Delta ecosystem health.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 31 regarding the Delta Reform Act and Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
6055	1	This makes no common sense. We are spending an enormous amount on a high speed train. Why not invest in a regional solution which would change farming methods, add large water storage tanks for future droughts, look at regional pipelines from areas that regularly experience floods (better than oil pipelines). Let's not destroy the Northern California water system for bad farming practices and golf courses.	<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). 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 of water.</p>
6056	1	The twin tunnels are going to be an environmental disaster for the Bay Area. I oppose! Removing fresh water from the system will allow salt water to intrude far inland, destroying farmland and contaminating drinking water sources. Another bad idea.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria 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).
6057	1	Don't destroy our Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6058	1	I believe that this will lead to a further crumbling of the fragile ecosystem of the water system. Please do not allow this to happen.	<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 Proposed Project is intended to provide a more reliable water supply, with diversions that are more protective for fish, in accordance with the Delta Reform Act co-equal goals of improving water supply reliability and Delta ecosystem health. Please see Master Response 31 regarding the Delta Reform Act and Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
6059	1	I am concerned about the impact the tunnels will have on the Delta during construction as well as when they are put into use.	<p>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. In cases, where it is not possible to offset those significant impacts (see Chapter 31, Other CEQA/NEPA Required Sections for a complete list of significant and unavoidable impacts), that information will be provided in the Statement of Overriding Considerations and will be acted on by the decision makers with each lead agency to determine if the project should still be approved or not.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives) and Section 3 (Conveyance Facility Modifications to Alternative 4), and Section 5 (Revisions to Cumulative Impact Analyses) of the RDEIR/SDEIS address the impacts of the proposed project.</p>
6060	1	I'm signing because I grew up on the San Francisco Bay Delta. Boating, fishing, summers camping on Bethel Island and cruising the delta, winters at willow berm or korths. This is such an integral part of our identity as Northern Californians that to see it all wiped away by deceit, lies, and greed absolutely kills me and destroys my faith in government.	<p>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. Recreation areas that would experience direct impacts are listed in Table 15-15 of Chapter 15, Recreation.</p>
6061	1	This political move will only kick the can down the road for a few more years. It will also change and potentially kill an existing "natural" ecosystem.	<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. 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>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
6062	1	Tunnels = Stupid expenditure/Delta degradation. Reservoirs = better H2O [water] management, less cost.	<p>Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives) for the development and screening of project alternatives. Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and 37 (Water Storage) explain why a water storage component was screened out as an alternative.</p>
6063	1	I'm opposed to projects that involve man-made engineering of our natural 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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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>Please refer to Master Response 4 regarding alternatives and Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need of the proposed project.</p>
6064	1	This solution serves only a few, let us try for a better one.	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.
6065	1	I'm signing because I believe it will ruin the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6066	1	I was involved in stopping the Peripheral Canal project back in the 70's for the same reasons. This is the same project, but underground.	<p>Master Response 36 explains how the proposed project is different from the previously proposed Peripheral Canal. The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
6067	1	Because our livelihood and Delta needs to be left alone!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6068	1	I fish in the delta and I don't things to effect the fishing right now.	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.
6069	1	Water is vital to life, it is one of our most important issues. We can't take it from other places or use it wastefully and expect everything to be okay. We need to conserve and share what we already have, not dig giant tunnels.	<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>
6070	1	I want to protect the delta and feel money should be spent on water storage which would benefit all of California, instead of moving our water to Southern California.	DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point 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
			<p>improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</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. Please see Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports) and 3 (Purpose and Need), and 35 (MWD Water Supply) for further information.</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>
6071	1	There is already way too much water being diverted from the delta system. We need to farm smarter in the san Joaquin valley. No more cows, alfalfa, cotton and other water intensive agriculture that has no reason to be in California.	<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>For more information regarding agricultural beneficial water use please see Master Response 34.</p>
6072	1	It's a waste of money.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6073	1	I am a life-long central Californian and have loved the ecology of our Delta area for my whole life. I think the twin canals will devastate the delta without solving the water problem in this state. I love California, all of it!	<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>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 Proposed Project is intended to provide a more reliable water supply, with diversions that are more protective for fish, in accordance with the Delta Reform Act co-equal goals of improving water supply reliability and Delta ecosystem health.</p> <p>Please also refer to Master Response 31 (Delta Reform Act), Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), and Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place).</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
6074	1	<p>This is an outrage! By diverting this much needed water to a group of people that excel at wasting this precious resource. Our way of life here depends on this water staying where it is. Not only will this diversion kill an entire eco- system it will also decimate an entire industry known as our food source, farming! Where will the food come from? This is a multibillion dollar industry just within San Joaquin County. This will affect more counties than that. Recreation in the area will be ruined. A multimillion dollar industry.</p> <p>Why is it that we, in Northern California are bust cutting back, drastically, our water use and the people in Southern California are not!? Why are we not forcing the water wasters to live by the same rules the farmers south of this county are forced to live by? Let them suffer the cost that our food producers are saddled with. Just so the can have their pretty lawns, and have the water running down the city gutter systems. Desalinization works. Put the money into the technology instead of a train that takes us down their faster! Ridiculous!</p>	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
6075	1	Diverting water from San Francisco Bay Delta to San Joaquin Valley Delta will cause the disastrous impact to the California.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6076	1	It seems like we are slow learners. Most of these solutions make a lot of money for a few people and then over time when nature overtakes the project we have to remediate because "you can't fool mother nature" save our money and our delta stop the tunnel project.	Please refer to Master Response 5 regarding implementation of costs and Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
6077	1	This proposed water diversion from the delta is as wasteful as it is destructive to critical delta habitat.	DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.
6078	1	I oppose the delta tunneling.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6079	1	I am opposed to the project. I am very concerned about water quality, impact on fish and wildlife as well as availability of water for Delta water users in the Delta should the project proceed.	<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. 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.</p> <p>Resource areas are addressed separately in the EIR/EIS under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including water quality (Chapter 8), fish and aquatic resources (Chapter 11), terrestrial biological resources (Chapter 12), and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible.</p>
6080	1	This is a crime against our waterways.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6081	1	Keep Northern water in the North! Save fresh water in the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6082	1	Tunnels are a very bad idea.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
6083	1	The Sacramento Delta needs the water to remain healthy.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6084	1	This is another waste of money and a power grab for bonehead brown. But more importantly it suppresses the water rights of the central valley.	The proposed project does not propose any changes to the guidelines by which water deliveries are allocated among those entities receiving water from the SWP. Please see Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via the conveyance facilities.
6085	1	The tunnels will upset the balance of nature. A Delta is important to the balance of the bay and rivers and the environment.	<p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. The project would help to address the resilience and adaptability of the Delta to climate change through water delivery facilities combined with a range of operational flexibility. In addition to the added water management flexibility created by new water diversions and operational scenarios, the project would improve habitat, increase food supplies and reduce the effects of other stressors on the Delta ecosystem. Please see Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need of the proposed project.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is intended to provide a more reliable water supply, with diversions that are more protective for fish, in accordance with the Delta Reform Act co-equal goals of improving water supply reliability and Delta ecosystem health. Please see Master Response 31 for more information regarding the Delta Reform Act.</p> <p>By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water 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.</p>
6086	1	This is outrageous -- lack of drinking water for San Joaquin, etc.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environment impacts in the EIR/S were raised.
6087	1	We need to keep the water up North, for all our producing fruit trees and crops.	<p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations.</p> <p>By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water 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. For the project's agricultural impacts and proposed mitigation, please refer to Chapter 14 of the EIR/EIS and of the RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A (Agricultural Resources) and Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact).</p> <p>Please also see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
6088	1	I believe that the tunnels would have tragic effects on the ecosystem of the California Delta waterways. I believe that the consequences far outweigh the benefits.	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. Although many of the proposed alternatives included meritorious water policy principles, the proposals rejected by the Lead Agencies did not qualify as appropriate alternatives for various reasons. For example, proposals were

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>rejected because they were inconsistent with the project’s objectives and purpose and need or included components that are beyond the scope of the project. The text of the Draft EIR/EIS in Chapter 3 (section 3.2) and Appendix 3A to that document thoroughly explain the process used to develop the alternatives, and explain why certain potential alternatives were considered but ultimately rejected by the Lead Agencies. Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives).</p> <p>DWR’s fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. The 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. Please see Master Response regarding the purpose and need of the proposed project.</p> <p>The Proposed Project is intended to provide a more reliable water supply, with diversions that are more protective for fish, in accordance with the Delta Reform Act co-equal goals of improving water supply reliability and Delta ecosystem health. (Master Response 31 [Delta Reform Act])</p> <p>By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water 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.</p>
6089	1	The Tunnels plan is bad for the environment, bad for the economy, bad for human health. Please restore the Delta instead!	The issue raised 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).
6090	1	I believe California's natural water resources such as marshes, estuary's, delta's or canals and any naturally inhabiting animal's environment is crucial to the restoration of our beautiful historic state. Invading naturally occurring ecosystems for water and agriculture is counter-productive to California's best interest when we have been in such a large draught now for years. Now is the time to promote proper water usage and hold people accountable for one's water use. Starting from the top with government funded agencies. Lead by positive example and not be fueled monetary interest! I love the state of California and having always been a citizen of Sacramento. This would thoroughly affect our communities and natural existing wildlife preserves. Restore the delta!	<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>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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>discharges and changes to the food web, increases in water temperatures, and introduction of non-native and invasive species. The Delta will remain in a highly altered state for the foreseeable future and the project is not intended to address all the past harms or restore the Delta to a pre-altered state.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. The documentation generated by this proposed project has undergone extensive public and scientific input, discussion, and transparency, including the posting of administrative draft chapters online and providing many more opportunities for public participation than is normally required by the CEQA/NEPA processes (see Master Response 41 [Transparency])</p>
6091	1	Governor Brown's "Water Fix" will destroy the Delta.	<p>The project was initiated by former Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, who was twice elected by a majority of California voters. The process has continued under the administration of his successor, Edmund G. Brown, Jr. Hence, the project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria 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 comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
6092	1	I have lived in the San Joaquin valley most of my life. The Tunnels will destroy the fresh water supply, farming and habitat that will be unrepairable. Why would this be something any man would ever do?	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. 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 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
6093	1	It is unforgiving to spend a ton of money to move water from part of the state to the other to essentially and eventually create a lack of water in the north, which is what you are trying to solve in the south - makes no sense to me. shifting from one place to the other, at a high cost, to create the same situation in the place you are shifting the water from.	<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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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. 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 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>
6094	1	We do not need to destroy the Delta on the whim of someone who continually can be bought by big Southern California money.	DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 45 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.
6095	1	The Tunnels idea has never been a good one! I am especially concerned on how this will affect the Delta, the almond growers and the rice fields. I wholeheartedly agree with everything this petition says. Please stop the Delta Tunnels project!	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
6096	1	Tunnels are wrong. Horrible outdated water policy.	<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>The Proposed Project is intended to provide a more reliable water supply, with diversions that are more protective for fish, in accordance with the Delta Reform Act co-equal goals of improving water supply reliability and Delta ecosystem health. The 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>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives), Master Response 31 (Delta Reform Act), and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
6097	1	Because I care about the health of the delta and the ocean and the entire food chain.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6098	1	I am a part owner of the above property on Steamboat Slough whose water flow will be directly affected by these outflow tunnels.	Changes in flows in Steamboat Slough downstream of Sutter Slough are presented in Appendix 5A, Section C, of the Draft EIR/EIS. Flows in Steamboat and Sutter Sloughs under the Proposed Action and the other action alternatives would be lower as compared to the Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative.
6099	1	We need to save our Delta, endangered species and Northern California's water and habitat!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6100	1	As an avid fisherman I oppose this project to the fullest extent.	Please refer to Master Response 17 regarding striped bass.
6101	1	Water conservation/reduction is key to Southern California's water issues. The watersheds of Northern California, our fisheries and wildlife are vital to our health and economy.	It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 (Demand Management) for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The scope and purpose of the proposed project is much more limited. As explained in Chapter 2 Project Objectives and Purpose and Need of the Final EIR/EIS, the fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the State Water Project (SWP) system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and Central Valley Project (CVP) south-of-Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework with statutory and contractual obligations. Please also refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) for further information.
6102	1	We cannot band-aid the problem and disrupt more and more ecosystem.	<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>By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria 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>Although many of the proposed alternatives included meritorious water policy principles, the proposals rejected by the Lead Agencies did not qualify as appropriate alternatives for various reasons. For example, proposals were rejected because they were inconsistent with the project's objectives and purpose and need</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>or included components that are beyond the scope of the project. The text of the Draft EIR/EIS in Chapter 3 (section 3.2) and Appendix 3A to that document thoroughly explain the process used to develop the alternatives, and explain why certain potential alternatives were considered but ultimately rejected by the Lead Agencies.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives), Master Response 31 (Delta Reform Act), and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
6103	1	California has technology to manage and increase water supply that does not impact the environment in such a permanent manner as the tunnel project.	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.
6104	1	Hey, you politicians, stop rerouting the water from the Sacramento-San Francisco Delta. Leave the water alone. Reroute the people, not the water! If people decide to live where there is no water, they have obviously made their decision to live without water. Quit wasting our money (taxes) and stealing the water from the Bay Area Delta.	<p>As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Please refer to Master Response 5.</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>
6105	1	It is evident that not all concerns and considerations have been taken seriously by those advocating this ill-considered plan. The delicate balance of our Delta is being undermined by interests ignoring the long-term impact of the tunnels. And where is the vetting process for the economic feasibility? There are safer and more effective plans to deal with our water issues that have been researched and analyzed. Come on, Governor Brown. Do the right thing.	<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 proposed project, Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7 regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management, and Master Response 37 regarding water storage.</p>
6106	1	As a California Indian, this is a further attempt at the completion of a genocide that has never ceased. Now it wears a cape of degrees from higher education and uses bigger words in tandem with its old friend, legislation, but remains the same foe.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6107	1	I oppose Governor Brown's poorly-thought-out water grab which will cause the possible extinction of Delta smelt, Chinook salmon and other species that depend on cold flowing water in the Delta.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
6108	1	Because I am opposed to the peripheral tunnel. It is wrong!	Master Response 36 explains how the proposed project is different from the previously proposed Peripheral Canal. The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats.
6109	1	Stop the Tunnels!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6110	1	The tunnels will add no extra drop of water, yet will destroy habitats and communities.	<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. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>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>
6111	1	Desalination plants should be explored in Southern California.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 63. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
6112	1	I live in the Central Valley of California and as an outdoorsman I highly oppose these changes to the Delta. We need the Delta like California needs water.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6113	1	Save marshlands! Los Angeles is a desert; they shouldn't even exist if they can't sustain themselves! Save water for agriculture!	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).
6114	1	No tunnels!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6115	1	We need a sane and comprehensive water plan that services all of California, not just Los Angeles County and Southern California. This isn't it. Keep trying!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
6116	1	I am a resident and business owner. Tunnels will absolutely devastate this community. Tunnels are not a viable option for the challenges we face as a state with regards to water.	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.
6117	1	I oppose the tunnels strongly!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
6118	1	I am strongly opposed because of its impact on agribusiness and the environment.	<p>The California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. The proposed project does not propose any changes to existing agricultural practices.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria 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>
6119	1	I care about our Delta's future!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6120	1	Politicians are money-[grubbing], unprofessional people I have met. Jerry Brown needs to go. The Tunnels need to stop now.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6121	1	I trust Restore the Delta and they say no tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6122	1	I oppose the tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6123	1	I am opposed to the Delta tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6124	1	I love the Delta and want to help preserve it.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6125	1	The plan is wrong.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6126	1	Stop the tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6127	1	Preserve the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6128	1	Our governor is out of control. Tunnels, bullet trains. Are you kidding me?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6129	1	The Delta needs to be saved!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6130	1	I want to save our Delta!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6131	1	We need to stop the tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6132	1	Save the Sacramento River.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6133	1	It is not right!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6134	1	We oppose the tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6135	1	I want to save our Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6136	1	I oppose [the tunnels].	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6137	1	It is corporate greed.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
6138	1	I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Delta Tunnels plan.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
6139	1	Save the Delta! No tunnel!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6140	1	I am against the tunnels being built.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6141	1	I oppose the tunnels in California.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6142	1	Stop the Delta tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6143	1	Do not agree.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6144	1	Impeach Moonbeam!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6145	1	I am strongly opposed to the building of the Delta tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6146	1	How can we explain ruining the Earth to our future families?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6147	1	This will directly affect myself and my family.	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.
6148	1	The tunnels are [expletive deleted].	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6149	1	Please, please, no tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6150	1	Some things should just be left alone.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6151	1	This is completely wrong.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6152	1	We need our Delta!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6153	1	I grew up fishing here and I want my kids to have a passion for fishing here like I do.	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.
6154	1	I strongly oppose the Delta Tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6155	1	Stop the tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6156	1	I oppose any tunnels in the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6157	1	I oppose the Delta tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6158	1	I oppose the tunnels and the BDCP.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6159	1	I oppose the tunnels in the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6160	1	I grew up around the Delta and it is truly an amazing place for wildlife.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such 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).
6161	1	I oppose the tunnels!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6162	1	I grew up in the Delta. It needs to be free of dirty politicians' hands.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6163	1	I am a Delta fisherman. I am against southwest valley agriculture.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6164	1	Opposing the Delta tunnels!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6165	1	I oppose Governor Brown's tunnel plan.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6166	1	I oppose the tunnel idea.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6167	1	I used to live on the Delta and something like this would kill me inside.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6168	1	I do not like the idea!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6169	1	Save the Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6170	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.
6171	1	This is not what needs to be done first and foremost.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6172	1	The government is a complete joke and this cannot happen.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
6173	1	I have lived in Fairfield my whole life. I would hate to see it destroyed.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6174	1	Stop the tunnels!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6175	1	Against Delta tunnels. Stop the tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6176	1	It is a horrible idea.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6177	1	[It is] not right!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6178	1	I think [it is] a terrible project.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6179	1	Save the Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6180	1	I love the Delta and we need the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6181	1	I am vehemently opposed to the tunnel project.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6182	1	I want to save the Delta and stop the 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
6183	1	Haven't the manipulators done enough damage to this State in the name of "progress", then blamed us for it?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6184	1	I am opposed to the tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6185	1	Honorable Governor Brown, are you out of your friggin' mind?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6186	1	My grandparents, parents, cousins, and aunts have all worked on these farms for the farmers losing their land. They have helped the community and families like [mine], with work.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6187	1	I completely oppose the tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6188	1	The Delta needs to be saved.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6189	1	We don't need to mess with a good thing.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6190	1	Save the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6191	1	I depend on the Delta for my charter business.	Waterways would remain navigable in the vicinity of all project construction. Implementation of mitigation measures and environmental commitments related to noise, visual effects, transportation, agriculture, and recreation, would reduce adverse effects (see Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs). Changes in recreational expenditures could also affect regional employment and income, but these have not been quantified.
6192	1	It needs to be stopped.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6193	1	Save our Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6194	1	I oppose the tunnels.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6195	1	I don't want the tunnels!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6196	1	I want to stop the tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6197	1	Stop the tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6198	1	Save the Delta!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6199	1	I lived in the Delta and want to preserve it.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6200	1	Save the Delta!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6201	1	Save the California Delta [and] Northern California's water!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6202	1	I oppose the tunnels!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6203	1	Save the Delta!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6204	1	I strongly oppose the tunnel project.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6205	1	Save the Delta!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
6206	1	Save the Delta!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6207	1	I oppose this project.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6208	1	I want to save the Delta!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6209	1	Restore the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6210	1	I oppose the Delta tunnels! Please help.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6211	1	I oppose the destruction of the California Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6212	1	[The WaterFix 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.
6213	1	Save the Delta!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6214	1	I oppose the Delta tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6215	1	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.
6216	1	Save the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6217	1	[I am] against the tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6218	1	Stop the tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6219	1	[The WaterFix] 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.
6220	1	I oppose the twin tunnel project.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6221	1	It [the WaterFix] is a stupid 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.
6222	1	I don't want to see the tunnels built.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6223	1	[The WaterFix is 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. N
6224	1	I'm against the state building the tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6225	1	I oppose the tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6226	1	No tunnels!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6227	1	Save the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6228	1	Save the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6229	1	Strongly opposed to the tunnels!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
6230	1	Strongly opposed to the tunnels!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6231	1	Don't 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.
6232	1	This [the WaterFix] 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.
6233	1	[The WaterFix] needs to stop.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6234	1	I oppose the tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6235	1	Protect the environment now! No Delta Tunnels!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6236	1	Save the Bay Area!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6237	1	[I] definitely oppose this project.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6238	1	I do not agree with the proposed tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6239	1	Help save the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6240	1	[The WaterFix] is just 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.
6241	1	[The WaterFix is] a really 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.
6242	1	This [WaterFix project] is ludicrous.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
6243	1	Save the Delta, a very special place.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6244	1	Leave [the Delta] alone.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6245	1	I 100% fully support doing whatever it takes to retain the Delta!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6246	1	[We] need to save the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6247	1	I am [writing] to express my strong opposition to the Delta Tunnels plan.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6248	1	We need to stop things like this!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6249	1	I am not in favor of anything that will further ruin our glorious state.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6250	1	Save the Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6251	1	We do not need this [WaterFix project].	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.
6252	1	I oppose the building of the Delta tunnels!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6253	1	I oppose the Delta Tunnel project.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6254	1	[The WaterFix] 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.
6255	1	I oppose the Delta Tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6256	1	I love the Delta the way it is!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6257	1	I am concerned for my relatives who live near the Bay. Their environment's welfare is their welfare.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6258	1	I am an avid fisherman and value the Delta in its current form.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6259	1	It seems as if it is tilted to the people who have more money than those who don't.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6260	1	I love the Delta just the way it is!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6261	1	Save the Delta. It's the right thing to do.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
6262	1	I want to save the Delta and stop the tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6263	1	I live in Stockton and want to save our Delta waterways.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6264	1	I want to protect the Delta!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6265	1	I am against Governor Brown's tunnel project.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6266	1	I oppose the tunnel projects.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6267	1	[The WaterFix is 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.
6268	1	I am a born and raised Stockton resident [and] these tunnels are a concern.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6269	1	I oppose the Delta tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6270	1	I do not agree with the planned tunnel proposal.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6271	1	I oppose the tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6272	1	I oppose the Delta Tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6273	1	Stop the tunnels!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6274	1	Preserve our Delta!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
6275	1	Save our Delta!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6276	1	Save the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6277	1	I oppose the Delta Tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6278	1	Basta al destrucción! [Enough of the destruction!] (via Google Translate)	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6279	1	I oppose poor decisions.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6280	1	Save our Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6281	1	This whole idea is completely nuts!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6282	1	Please help me stop this.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6283	1	I am opposed to "welfare" programs for rich corporations who are the only entities that will benefit from this destructive, unnecessary project.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.
6284	1	This proposal is awful.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6285	1	I love the Delta as is.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6286	1	These tunnels are a joke.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6287	1	I want to protect the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6288	1	Viva la Delta!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6289	1	This is wrong!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6290	1	I care about the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6291	1	I care about Discovery Bay!	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
6292	1	California is my home and I want to protect it.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6293	1	Stop the madness!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6294	1	I am a 6th generation pear farmer and I support the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6295	1	#FishyFishay #SaveTheDelta #StopTheTunnels #StopTheCanal	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6296	1	I am a local who does not agree.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
6297	1	It is ridiculous.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6298	1	This is insane.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6299	1	I believe in this cause to save the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
6300	1	No new tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6301	1	This has to stop now!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6302	1	I oppose.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6303	1	We live in the North Delta where we have farmed for 6 generations and see our way of life as threatened without choice through the democratic process.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. For more information regarding impacts to agriculture and its associated mitigation measures, please see Chapter 14 of the FEIR/EIS.
6304	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.
6305	1	I am a 4th generation Delta girl! No tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6306	1	This is wrong.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6307	1	Please explain to me why this is even being considered? Sounds like nonsense to me.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 45 (Purpose and Need).
6308	1	I believe we should have an extraction tax for all resources in California ofr minerals, oil, etc.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.
6309	1	Let's get back to nature, not tunnel it.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6310	1	I like when people do not have to drink salt water and the fish can live.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6311	1	This is a bad idea, Governor!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6312	1	Ridiculous idea.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
6313	1	The proposed project is expected to require transmission-level electric service and the relocation or protection in place of existing Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) electric and gas facilities. PG&E is an Investor Owned Utility under CPUC [California Public Utilities Commission] jurisdiction. Permitting for the construction and relocation of PG&E transmission facilities is directed by CPUC General Order 131-D.	Discussion of GO 131-D is included in Chapter 20, Public Services and Utilities
6313	2	Relocation Work: This proposed project will require the relocation of PG&E facilities. RDEIR/SDEIS Chapter 20, Public Services and Utilities, indicates that the proposed project would interfere with existing electric transmission lines and gas pipelines. Under Alternative 4, the RDEIR/SDEIS indicates that interference could occur with three PG&E 500-kV lines, two PG&E 115-kV lines, and six PG&E natural gas pipelines. Under other alternatives, interference could also occur with PG&E 230-kV lines.	The commenter's summary of the relocation work is correct. Please note that Alternative 4A is the new preferred alternative.
6313	3	Interconnection Work: This proposed project will require interconnection to the electrical grid. Either PG&E, the Sacramento Municipal Utility District, the Western Area Power Administration, or some combination of the three electric utility providers will deliver power to the proposed project. Should PG&E be selected, the CPUC [California Public Utilities Commission] will be required to permit their work pursuant to CPUC General Order 131-D. The CPUC is	Under Alternatives 1A through 8, electrical power to operate the new north Delta pumping plant facilities would be delivered through 230 kV transmission lines that would interconnect with a local utility at a new or existing utility substation depending on the conveyance alignment. The alignment of this transmission line and its interconnection point would be based on the selection of a power provider for the project following selection of a conveyance alignment. This selection is ongoing and the alignment of the transmission lines will be finalized at a later date. The commenter's willingness to work with interested parties is

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		available to work with DWR/USBOR and PG&E to ensure that the permitting process occurs efficiently.	appreciated.
6314	1	The Delta is a tourist destination, it is the last refuge of numerous native species of fish and fowl. It is also a large contributor to the State's agricultural output. There is only a limited supply of fresh water available to the state. To continue to build communities in arid areas without planning for the water they use is bad policy. Taking water from one place and moving it hundreds of miles no longer is a good option. New urban areas must first find local sources of renewable water supplies. Humans must live with the earth's other life forms, not eradicate them one by one.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.
6314	2	Please, recognize that the Southern California land is mostly arid and that area needs to create local water sources. Desalination, reduce water usage and reuse water through treatment and filtering.	Please see Master Response 7 regarding desalination.
6314	3	Who would carry the cost of a major water project? New community taxpayers or the entire population of California? The cost of any project should be borne by the people who reap the rewards.	Please see Master Response 5 regarding cost and funding.
6315	1	The water resources we have now are oversubscribed, and the ecosystem always gets the short end of the stick. Our future water resources will be diminishing as climate change continues. We need fundamental and radical changes in the way water is managed, and we need to prioritize the ecosystem. The Delta tunnels plan is old-school thinking.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 19 regarding climate change.
6316	1	Our first obligation with California's water is to protect the natural landscapes and life forms that were here first. Next is to consider the needs of people. Only then should farming and corporate interests be considered.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6317	1	The difference between the new tunnels and the old idea of Peripheral Canal is that the tunnels cost more.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. For more information regarding the peripheral canal, please see Master Response 36.
6317	2	A better WaterFix would be to buy out the Westland farmers and let their land be fallow or grazed.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6318	1	This tunnels plan is a terrible idea. Just the worst. It is, in fact, amazing to me how many bad ideas people can dream up to make a situation worse.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6319	1	Southern California needs to find a fix-it plan that does not degrade the Northern California environment and resources. We do not need further irreversible problems	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		created in other parts of the state.	Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6320	1	Fresh water is a limited resource and the economies based on limitless water availability must restructure themselves now. Please do not force Northern California to pay for the short-sightedness of Southern California communities and their leaders.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6321	1	Less water, not more, should be taken from the Delta. One river system in California has already been destroyed by excessive water deliveries to farmers who have little incentive to conserve.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
6322	1	The Delta is already a stressed ecosystem. The BDCP makes no sense; all studies show there is not enough water to support the tunnels project.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need.
6323	1	This is not the first, but I hope it will be the last, proposal that hopes to sacrifice Northern California for Southern California commercial interests.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need.
6324	1	This "Fix" will not solve California's water problems. It will damage the environment and further erode nature's ability to self-regulate and sustain many species, including our own.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 29 regarding the Endangered Species Act.
6325	1	[The California WaterFix] will not add one drop of water to California while increasing the number of people able to use the water.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 32 regarding water rights.