
From: Birkie, Wolfe <WBirkie@kcc.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 3:21 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Please Stop the Delta Tunnels

No-one can make a conscionable decision to proceed with the Delta Tunnels.

- 1) The tunnels will not be able to (Legally) move any more water than the current system today so to spend \$15B on this system is ludicrous.
- 2) If the long-term plan is to eventually move more water through this system, than this is a water grab by the central farmers and southern part of the state with a huge environmental expense to northern California

I would much rather see that money used to re-build the current delta infrastructure and to also help valley farmers implement a more sustainable model with a reduction of water intensive crops and a move to drip systems. Growing crops like hay, cotton and almonds for export in California does not make sense and is not equitable for the Northern Californian environment nor its residents.

Wolfe Birkie
(p) 415.385.6913

This e-mail is intended for the use of the addressee(s) only and may contain privileged, confidential, or proprietary information that is exempt from disclosure under law. If you have received this message in error, please inform us pro by reply e-mail, then delete the e-mail and destroy any printed copy. Thank you.

From: Victoria Reeder <victoriareeder@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 8:49 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Please Protect Water for all Californians

Dear Madams and Sirs,

We are not being allowed to vote on these “underground canals.” Even the legislature cannot vote on this proposal. The only way to stop it is to voice our opposition during the comment period, which ends this Friday.

Please preserve clean, fresh water for drinking, recreation, fishing, industry, and agriculture. Both habitat and endangered species would be affected adversely if the Delta tunnels are built. Without increased, not decreased, fresh water flows, the San Francisco Bay Delta ecosystem will continue to degrade. Our Bay will die along with the newly created wetlands.

L.A. drained the Owens Valley and they have senior rights to the Colorado River. Now they want our Sacramento River water as well.

International water experts promote local solutions. Clearly California has a serious water issue, but building an exorbitantly expensive, one-size-fits-all project will not solve the state’s water supply problem. Our water supply issues should be solved locally with lower use, infrastructure repairs as well as water capture and reuse.

Why should we let Metropolitan Water, which is the largest wholesaler of water in the country, make a profit on water that is sent from the Sacramento River? You and I will be paying for the tunnels.

We Californians have reduced our water use by about 33% just this year. We need to learn to live with our limited water supply. Due to climate change, California will not be getting more precipitation. Farmers, too, need to make choices about which crops they grow. Some crops, like alfalfa, should not be grown in California. They should be grown in parts of the country with higher rainfall.

There are far better and less costly solutions to providing a reliable water supply to ALL Californians.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Victoria Reeder

From: Greta Lacin <gretal@lacin.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 7:33 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Power lines and birds

I am writing to comment on the Bay Delta Conservation Plan.

Specifically, regarding the placement of power lines, both temporary and permanent, associated with the project. I am especially concerned about the effect on birds. I have recently read that Fish and Game is reviewing the effect of power lines on bird populations, especially migrating birds. I know that water birds concentrate in the area being considered for this project. Power lines are discussed in the EIR, but I saw only their impact on agriculture. I did not see the issue of their effect on concentrated population of birds. It is well known that migrating populations of cranes, for example, are forced into smaller areas of the Delta as the drought continues. I am concerned that this issue will lead to diminishment of these already stressed and decreasing populations of birds.

Thank you,
Greta Lacin

From: Margaret Janssen <w1235367@apps.losrios.edu>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 8:50 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: Public Comment on the Delta Tunnel Plan

I am against the construction of the tunnels under the Delta. The construction would disrupt people's lives, destroy habitat and kill fish. Once in action, the tunnels would divert fresh water that is needed to balance the salinity in the Delta and keep salt water from backing upriver beyond Rio Vista. The project, even when completed, would disrupt lives of a half-million people who live in or around the Delta, kill endangered salmon and other fish, and disturb birds' navigation along the Pacific Coast flyway, birds that use the Delta for a stop-over.

Another irritating thing about this proposed project is that there is a good chance that future politicians will decide to "restore" the delta and close down the tunnels in a fashion similar to the restoration of the Everglades, and then we will have to pay billions to bring back water flows the way they were in 2014.

No, No, No to the Delta Tunnel Plan.

Margaret Janssen
CRC student and long-time Sacramento resident

From: nancy <nancy@zsc.org>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 4:52 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Cc: brian@bpspr.com; barbara@restorethedelta.org
Subject: Public Comment on the Delta Tunnels Plan/BDCP/CA Water Fix

Public Comment on the Delta Tunnels Plan/BDCP/CA Water Fix.

I think 'the tunnels' are impractical - and support an UNSUSTAINABLE development practice of uncontrolled URBANISATION, disastrous for N. Calif. environments and ripped-off taxpayers statewide.

Nancy L. Leman
5326 Camellia Ave.
Sacramento, CA 95819

From: roberta cravalho <aychihuahua423@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 11:44 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: RDEIR/SDEIS

To Whom It May Concern:

Thank you for permitting me to voice my comments and concerns regarding the RDEIR/SDEIS. The document has left me with more questions than answers. There are no clear statements about water yields, costs, or assurances that the California Water Fix would work the way it is proposed. As a native Californian, I am left wondering just exactly what is going to happen to our primary water source, our agribusiness, our environment, and our fishing industry. The document delineates a plan that is illegal, unscientific, environmentally unsound, ineffective in purpose, and not well funded. Because of obfuscation and the vast amount of unclear or incomplete data within the document, as a citizen, educator, and reader I am left muddled in mud.

I cordially ask that the Tunnels Be Stopped!

Sincerely,
Roberta Cravalho

From: Rogene Reynolds <reynolds6568@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 8:38 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: RDEIR/SDEIS Comments

We would like to express our concern that in its current form, the Recirculated Draft Environmental Report/Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the BDCP/CA WATER FIX is deficient in its assessment of the impacts of decreased freshwater flows through the Delta.

RDEIR/SDEIS modeling documents find the project will violate Clean Water Act standards for boron, bromide, chloride, electrical conductivity (salt), nitrate, dissolved organic carbon, mercury, and selenium (Appendix B).

It is unacceptable that this project should move forward with such results. Good water quality is the lifeblood of Delta fisheries, farms, recreation and municipal uses. Any project that degrades such quality is inconsistent with Federal Law. It is also patently immoral to separate the freshening flows from the Delta to serve as better water sourced for export.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Rogene and Bill Reynolds

From: Jacklyn Shaw <jjjjshaw@verizon.net>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 11:09 AM
To: BDCPcomments; BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: RDEIR/SDEIS index is suggestive but superficial on tunnels along the Delta River, lacking common sense and voice for agricultural preserves (and tourism)

TO: BDCPComments@icfi.com, BDCP.comments@noaa.gov

RE: RDEIR/SDEIS index is suggestive but superficial on tunnels along the Delta River, lacking common sense and voice for agricultural preserves (and food industries) with Delta Sierra Rivers, not to mention recreational tourism and related livelihoods.

on 10/26/15 from jjjjshaw@verizon.net

- (1) For restorethedelta.org Delta Sierra, and aquifer (natural ground water vs salt marsh) — how can we have precise terms:
- (a) RESERVOIRS (natural cycle) instead of just storage (NOT underground twin tunnels, 35 miles, 40 feet wide, like “chunnel” for autos between Britain and France). Not a drop more would go 400 miles away.
 - (b) refurbish Delta DREDGING from Sacramento City to Antioch Bay Bridge (with USACE 100 year maps as well as private business)
 - (c) REFORESTATION (after fires and muddy flooding)
 - (d) 26 points for California DESALINATION (like to Bakersfield Basin), like Navy Ships with deep blue ocean. (90% of all Californians live 30 miles from the ocean.)
 - (e) WATER TECH BUSINESS JOBS investment, including desalination. (Our drinking water in NorCal has been affected by the drought, so why give mirage of sending water to SoCal desert or semi-arid areas. Also, we have lower crop tonnage, with “hail” damage.
 - (f) INVESTMENTS or losses? If LA Metro water can afford to offer purchasing four Delta islands (without beneficial use to area of agricultural preserves, historic tourism, etc.), then how can we foster their funds for cost effective California Desalination jobs, with 2/3 more water!
 - (g) Save NorCal fertile SOIL of Delta counties: California is number one in FOOD CROPS, currently (for USA and 6th in world). Why put in a DESTRUCTIVE twin tunnels to literally make the Delta region into a dust bowl?
 - (h) Productive property rights, devalued by water taxes or the like? Who plans for eminent domain of 300 farm families, productive for 150 years? Why take Delta river and ground water and DEVALUE property with ground wells for family agribusiness in food crops, with NorCal role in California #1 in food crops? What percentage of stakeholders are growers in agricultural preserves, stewards in reforestation areas, etc.
 - (i) COSTS/LOSSES? Where is agribusiness job development other than making a concrete jungle, with costs for government jobs. Our suggestions and queries seem ignored or rewritten for a revised agenda. Californians voted against the peripheral canal ideas in the 1980’s. Delta scientists and related resources in local field research disclaim the RDEIR/SDEIS. Is it refIXing a bottomless expense, damaging current productivity?

We appreciate timely, affordable opportunity to express our valid concerns against a destructive conveyance in the beautiful, historic Sierra and Delta Rivers. USDA provides a beautiful poster on the natural water cycle, with charts. Californians are creative (for business jobs), not destructive of productivity.

Sincerely,

Jacklyn Shaw, Ed.D.

Zin grower, Lodi, CA

*20 miles from Rio Vista, heart of Delta

*Where's Mark Twain: he'd talk against dust kicking, mud slinging and obvious "coverup" (plans for Two underground twin tunnels, 40 foot wide, 35 miles), to devastate Delta River and adjacent counties, perhaps most fertile in world for food crops. (Why did Lahore near Karachi, Pakistan, look so much like the Sunset Port of Stockton? It is a related issue to learn, so close to home USA.)

From: Sam Murch <Sam.Murch@patagonia.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 3:39 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: I stand opposed to the Twin Tunnels Project

To whom it may concern.

As a active voter, farmer, and California resident I urge California to abandon it's plans to divert water via the twin tunnels project.

The state must reject the tunnels proposal, develop sound water solutions for California, and recognize the rights of rivers and the Delta to flow.

Until California realizes that throwing water around instead of addressing the issues at hand is foolhardy, we will wastefully apply water for crops that are not intended to be grown in desert climates.

Thank you for considering my comments

Samuel S. Murch
Sam.Murch@Patagonia.com
770 North Point
San Francisco, CA 94109
(415) 771-2050

From: Maryn Anderson <marynanderson@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 1:06 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: I strongly oppose the Delta Tunnels/California Water Fix plan

I live on a five generation family farm outside of Rio Vista, Ca. I frequently stand up paddle on the Sacramento River.

Please consider the many alternatives to the seriously flawed, and destructive Delta Tunnels/ California Water Fix Plan. I strongly oppose this expensive, environmentally harmful plan. I support the principles of the Delta Reform Act, and this plan does not.

Sincerely,

Maryn Anderson

From: Michael Golden <arcatagolden@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 1:56 PM
To: BDCPcomments; Elizabeth Murguia
Subject: Jerry's Tunnels

This is a joke, right?

You people aren't really contemplating building two thirty foot, or maybe forty foot in diameter tunnels to suck water out of the imperiled Sacramento River Delta to send to the Central Valley and Southern California at a cost of sixteen billion dollars or more.

You're not really going to push the endangered Sacramento River Chinook salmon, once the largest run in the State, over the brink of extinction, causing a loss that cannot be calculated to recreational, commercial, and tribal fisherman, and to the many businesses that live on fishing activity(see San Francisco Chronicle 10/28&29/15)..

You're not really going to continue to delude Central Valley farmers and Southern Californians into believing that the party can rock on forever, that they can continue to enjoy all the water they want at prices that don't reflect its true cost, encouraged more and more folks to move here, causing the population to increase so that we'll face the same problem again in a few years. Where would you build tunnels then?

And you wouldn't attempt such a huge project with such far-reaching impact without the knowing approval of either the Legislature or the voters?

You were just kidding, weren't you? I thought so!

Whew!

Michael Golden Bayside, CA.

From: Jacklyn Shaw <jjjjshaw@verizon.net>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 2:30 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Cc: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: More Questions on RDEIR/SDEIR, with Executive Summary. Please consider DISB/ Delta Scientists report in data on financial/economic/environmental losses?

On 9/15/15 from jjjjshaw@verizon.net (Lodi, CA, 95242)

Dear Bipartisan Representatives (CA):

RE: Thank you for added 60 days to Dec. 29th, 2015!!! So far the California Fix It could cause more drought [and dustiness]! (See Notes on questions.)

We appreciate the letter for added 60 days. We need alternatives: A petition to continue DREDGING to Antioch Bay for Stockton Port (not just Clifton Bay Court pumps, for faucet drips); California's 26 testing points for cost effective DESALINATION in various basins; and other energy resources for business JOBS.

Please clarify muddling of geographical names, like San Joaquin County (fertile), not Central Valley (28 counties mostly semi-arid) and San Joaquin Riverway. All farmer/ growers do not have the same soil. (See some questions below.)

In maps, please include elected counties and towns, not just water districts by governor appointments. USGS/ soil maps show all farmer/growers in Central Valley (about 400 miles from heart of North San Joaquin Delta) face drought.

Sincerely,

Jacklyn (E.L.) Shaw, Ed.D.

Lodi Zin Grower

* Lodi near I-5 is 15 miles from construction plan of destructive 30-45 miles for Twin Tunnels (the size of Chunnels from Britain to France). P.S. DISB, Delta/Scientists study enumerated flaws or losses on any twin tunnel near the Delta Rivers (a funnel to nowhere with not a drop more).

NOTES OF QUESTIONS:

(1) With California #1 in Food Crops, why are productive Delta family farms, recreation and historic tourism being threatened with eminent domain devaluing property values?

(2) Water district petition referred to "occasional reverse flows" near Sacramento City (Corwin, August, 2015), so what is beneficial about salt backup, to productive counties in food crops?

(3) The San Joaquin County farm bureau bulletins (Aug/Sept., 2015) noted that three more intakes (cruiser size near Sacramento City) would mean cutting off "fresh water", near heart of Delta. They write that they have attended water board meetings, but farmers / growers of Delta counties are not listened to: Why not?

(4) Renewed DELTA DREDGING was recommended by a basic engineer (A.M.) who helped maintain Delta levees on all the islands. He said that dredging improves the flow, that soil purifies the water (aeration and absorption), that silt can be rearranged (rather than sand bags that add weight).

(5) US House and Senate Funding for Levee maintenance by USACE/Corps (with 100 year maps) was sent to Washington State (sacbee.com 2014). Now, Port of Stockton area has algae growth from warmer waters. How soon will Delta Levee maintenance be renewed — before El Nino of heavy rains?

(6) Could the California Fix It (and redubbing of Eco-Restore) — cause MORE DROUGHT! The natural water cycle affects the cool Delta breeze to neighboring counties. (Ag gives cleaner air than smog from more housing.) More Intake plans (2, 3 and 5) would cause more dusty breeze and salt marshes instead of productive, fertile soil for food crops and recreational rivers in historic tourism development.

(7) Where are financial reports on Delta region LOSSES on food productivity, tourism, etc.— by devastating impact of CA Fix It at North Delta? What municipal already owns the first Intake near Freeport and Sacramento City? California is known for agriculture with most fertile Delta soil in the world. Housing and Fracking could use Desalination where 90% of Californians live near the Pacific Ocean.

(8) Check more questions from current sacfarmbureau.org bulletin on WOTUS, with words like ditches lumped under tributaries. Does conveyance mean huge concrete tunnels or faucet/ spigots control, like results of dry-docks in Folsom Dam? Some may over integrate. Could wetting the lips at a fountain be under federal jurisdiction? Can we keep city meters distinct from ag data by sensor / emitters used in electric bills? Chamber of Commerce says WOTUS rules would be a job killer, while farmers are proactive, entrepreneurial, and innovative — for food on the table. Thank you for the opportunity to express concerns to keep California 6th in the world as ag producer.

From: Wayne Montoya <wmbozo@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 12:39 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: My Comments on Revised Delta Conveyance EIR

As a lifelong Bay Area resident and recently retired scientist, i am sending these comments on the BDCP/CA WaterFIX EIR documents.

While many aspects may lead to improvements in water management, there are some extremely problematic issues with the Plan and EIR.

1) I do not support the large reconveyance pumping plans; the risk to the delta & bay environment and potential resulting negative economic impacts resulting (wildlife & environmental quality which directly supports fisheries, vacation & recreation businesses, home values when communities shrink due to reduced quality of life, etc..).

The costs are far too high to justify this aspect of the proposals and far better alternatives exist. The EIR is totally inadequate in addressing potential long and short term ramifications (environmental, economic, health, etc..) from this massive pumping & redirection.

2) The amount of monies allocated to improve the delta environment is far too low, way below what was recommended as "realistic minimums" just a few years ago (in prior proposals considered or pitched). The amount allocated for this purpose must be dramatically increased to adequately mitigate risks (not covered, asked or considered in the current EIR).

3) I fully agree with and support the points raised in the public comment submissions you have received from the following groups (and which were posted publicly). The concerns are scientific, fair & appropriate, and highlight or address many omissions, mistaken assumptions, gaps and other problems in the EIR/Plan:

3a) Delta Independent Science Board

Subject: Review of environmental documents for California WaterFix

Sent To: Randy Fiorini, Chair, Delta Stewardship Council

Charlton Bonham, Director, California Department of Fish and Wildlife

September 29, 2015

3b) Environmental Water Caucus

Subject: EWC Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Coordinated Long-Term Operation of the Central Valley Project and State Water Project

To: Ben Nelson, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation

September 29, 2015

Lastly, we must become smarter and learn from others who have successfully faced similar long term drought issues and adapted (e.g. Australia).

To start (as Australia did) we must legislatively & legally update water control & rights from our archaic & dysfunctional "first come, first served" system to one based on overall & logical scientific assessments, realistic needs AND an increased focus on recycling/reuse/reduction schemes, with equal emphasis on environment AND people AND business.

Only then will more beneficial, less costly and shared responsibility water management proposals be possible.

thanks you for the consideration.

Wayne Montoya
Palomar Dr. Redwood City, CA

From: stephen ajay <swajay43@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 3:12 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: My view

Don't build the tunnels.

Stephen Ajay
Professor Emeritus

From: peterarcht@comcast.net
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 3:38 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: NO delta tunnels to southern California desert

We absolutely oppose the tunnels planned by governor Jerry Brown to transport San Francisco Bay Delta water to artificially irrigated, dry Central Valley California. The factory farms can afford to go elsewhere, where water supply is prevalent. Small farmers can switch crops or move as well. Do not DESTROY one habitat to temporarily maintain another. Anyone who supports this tunnel plan is STUPID and/or capitulating to selfish, destructive commercial interests. Adamantly, Peter A. Ekstein & Patricia M. Carroll, Berkeley, California

From: apricot girl <apricot.farmer@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 6:21 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: NO on the twin tunnels

NO on the twin tunnels

Sent from my iPhone

From: Chere Mah <chereemah@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 5:38 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: No to diversion and antienvironmental engineering

I oppose efforts to divert water from the bay and delta for agribusiness. When will they grow nutrient dense food rather than products that inflate their bottom line. WE do know a subsidy for the wealthy when we see it and are not fooled. I was born in the central valley and have seen the water wasted for over 60 years. For raisins, almonds, cotton and wine. Chere Mah

From: Randy Merk <menlomerk@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 12:22 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: No to Jerry Brown's Tunnels

I very strongly oppose the construction of the Delta tunnels.

I believe they are a water grab by powerful West Valley agribusiness interests. It is the largest attempt at a transfer of public resources to private wealth in California history.

It makes absolutely no sense to destroy the greatest estuary on the West Coast, destroy the agricultural, recreational, and tourism interests of the Delta, destroy the salmon and crab industries that need a healthy bay and estuary to thrive, and destroy hundreds of wildlife and plant species just so a group of greedy corporate owners in the west valley - land so salt-poisoned that part of it has had to be retired and that spawned the Kesterson disaster - can receive more water to grow crops that should never have been grown there in the first place. This is crony capitalism at its most destructive.

As a California taxpayer, I strongly object to this poorly-conceived project. It represents antiquated thinking. When considering the bond repayment and operations expenses, costs zoom into the \$60+ billion range, and when examining the way costs have been underestimated for recent large California public works projects like high speed rail and the Bay Bridge, I anticipate costs would be far above this. Ratepayers who would suffer hugely increased water bills and property tax hikes prefer to face water challenges in more creative and ways such as:

- More aggressive water efficiency programs
- Funding water recycling and groundwater recharging projects statewide
- Retiring thousands of acres of impaired and pollution-generating farmlands in the southern San Joaquin Valley and using these lands for more sustainable and profitable uses, such as solar energy generation. Such retirement of marginal lands would free up water that could be put to better use.
- Improving Delta levees in order to address possible earthquake, flooding, and future sea level rise concerns at a cost of between \$2 - \$4 billion, orders of magnitude less than the cost of the tunnels.
- Upgrading leaky municipal water delivery systems statewide

As a fifth generation Californian and a daughter of the Delta, I am sad to say I have become very distrustful of the way you have handled this process. Shame on the State and Federal agencies for applying for tunnels permits before this comment period is over. Shame on BDCP for the manner in which EIR "Hearings" were designed to exclude comments. Shame on BDCP

for trying to rush the initial comment period. These actions indicate to me that you are not operating in good faith.

Here is the definition of the expression "the fix is in" is: **A process that has been rigged behind the scenes and its outcome will not reflect true justice.** Sadly, that is how I feel about the California Water Fix and those who are pushing it.

Every Californian should read *Cadillac Desert* by Marc Reisner. The California chapter is called "Chinatown." According to Reisner, back when Jerry's dad, Gov. Pat Brown, was pushing through the California Water Project, his Director of Water Resources, Bill Warne, told the farmers of the west valley that the surplus water they could receive (at the energy cost of delivery) should come with "**some restrictions. The surplus water should go only to lands that overlie the aquifer (the extreme southern part of the San Joaquin Valley has no usable groundwater at all). Otherwise, it would bring a lot of land into production that would be stranded when the surplus deliveries ended, creating even more pressure for new water development. The water would have to be sold on an interruptible basis, from one year to the next, and it ought to irrigate only pasture or alfalfa, not permanent crops such as orchards.** [Emphases mine.] **Otherwise, when the surplus ran out, the farmers, having invested a lot of money in trees, would begin pumping groundwater like crazy to protect their investment, and demand still more dams, and the vicious cycle the State Water Project was intended to stop would begin all over again.**" (Page 367)

Well, it appears that Bill Warne was prescient. He knew why that land shouldn't be in orchard production, but it seems that in the intervening years, the extraordinarily powerful agribusiness interests of the west valley have become convinced that they deserve as much water as they want to grow water-intensive crops like almonds, pistachios, and cotton. They have engaged in secret deals to do this. **Enough is enough. Stop the tunnels.**

Julie B. Merk
Menlo Park

From: Braly, Scott <sbraly@rjuhsd.us>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 3:26 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: No Tunnels

I am writing this email in opposition to the proposed Delta Tunnel Project. The tunnel project would be the death nail for the ecosystems of the California Delta, as well as seriously impacting the agriculture, economy, and culture of the North State. There is no way that you can build those massive tunnels through the heart of the Delta without having serious and unforeseen impacts on the hydrology, drainage, and ecosystems of the region. Many organizations and agencies have written reports on these consequences, and it's amazing to me that the proposed project has gotten this far, and still being considered.

The project creates no new water or storage at all, and the price tag is way too high. The proposed cost is projected to be at least 15 billion dollars, and maybe as much as \$60 billion, and would really only benefit a relatively few people, mainly the large industrial scale agribusinesses in the Southern Central Valley. The people of California would be better served by putting that money towards building desalinization plants on the coast, and building some new large impoundment reservoirs in the south state to catch the rain when it falls. We could do those things, and more, for less money than the tunnels would cost, and without destroying the whole Sacramento River/Delta Ecosystem. Please reject the propped tunnel project.

Sincerely,

Scott W. Braly

5567 Coronado Way

Rocklin, Ca. 95677

From: Patrick Pickerell <pat@peridotcorp.com>
Sent: Friday, October 30, 2015 9:13 AM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: No tunnels

Water diversions from the Delta are already way too much. The Tunnels are a blatant water grab by rich land owners and is guaranteed to destroy one of the greatest estuaries on the PLANET. NO TUNNELS AND NO ADDITIONAL DIVERSIONS to grow nuts in the desert.

Thanks,

Patrick Pickerell
President, Peridot Corporation
1072 Serpentine Lane
Pleasanton CA. 94566
925-461-8830 EXT 111

From: Caroline Perkins <cwheelerperkins@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 9:29 PM
To: BDCPcomments
Subject: No Tunnels

The tunnel project is not worthy of any further consideration or expense. It would be disastrous in so many regards both environmentally and financially. To solve your problems of needing more water, look at the facts and consider that the central valley is a desert and to grow crops that require so much water, and to even remove some crops in order to plant crops and orchards that require even more water is completely irresponsible environmentally and civilly. Truly those working for the water district and the government are smarter and more intelligent than to overlook the most logical solution to the water shortage. Yes, almonds as an example, represent a tremendous cash crop and economical asset to the California Economy and the pockets of select individuals, but at a cost far greater than anyone is acknowledging. It's time to concede that your project is, and always has been completely ill advised. No one wins with this project. LET IT GO>