

**From:** Ed Schnee <easchnee@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 28, 2015 7:50 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Cc:** easchnee@gmail.com  
**Subject:** I Oppose The Tunnels

FORM MASTER  
#15

**I am opposed to the Delta Tunnels because:**

1. The benefits do not match the cost. According to Dr. Jeff Michael, University of the Pacific, the estimated benefits for the project drop by \$10 billion without regulatory assurance for water deliveries so that costs EXCEED benefits by at least \$8 billion. The costs will be born by farmers and urban ratepayers. Since there is no added water, urban ratepayers obtain no benefit.
2. The rural and urban rate payers should be notified of the expected rate increases and vote approval, like any tax increase.
3. If farmers must pay for more costly water, they have stated they will need to convert to profitable crops like almonds to ship to Asia. Californians will not have fresh produce on their own tables.
4. The tunnels do not provide for any additional water in a drought after prior water rights and public trust needs are met. During many years, they are likely to be dry. Other alternatives do produce more water.
5. The California WaterFix does not help reduce reliance on Delta imports as mandated by the 2009 Delta Reform Act.
6. San Francisco Bay-Delta business, tourism, fishing, and farming communities cannot trust that the tunnels will be operated in a manner to protect our interest, especially because the State Water Resources Control Board, the Department of Water Resources, and the Bureau of Reclamation have allowed for the waiving and weakening of Delta water quality standards and species protections during the drought, endangering numerous Delta species and bringing some to the precipice of extinction.
7. The California EcoRestore is not part of the California WaterFix. Hence the California WaterFix does not meet the coequal goals required by the 2009 Delta Reform Act. Even if the EcoRestore were included, it does little more than meet the existing mitigation for prior damage, and does not mitigate for the new damage that will be caused by tunnel construction and by removing water that otherwise would flow through Delta.
8. The route selected is the worst alternative that could be selected since it does not protect Delta farm communities and Delta recreation as required by the 2009 Delta Reform Act. It is only the cheapest. A construction project through the heart of the Delta, through the sensitive estuary and loud pounding through bird habitats for years is not the way to protect the fish or fowl. Instead, the alternative to route the tunnels far east, by I-5, should replace the current route.
9. Construction plans include de-watering Delta farmers' wells for years, making farming and living in their homes not possible. Yet there is no provision to provide remuneration to them.
10. Barges and construction for years through recreational waterways is not the way to protect Delta recreation. The route to save the estuary, would be to route the tunnels far East, by I-5.

Sincerely,

Edward Schnee  
5443 Drakes Ct

Discovery Bay, CA. 94505

RECIRC2934