

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of JoAnn Anglin <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 6:36 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 27, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

This continues to be a project where the negatives continue to significantly outweigh the positives. It is not constructive and should not be constructed. Southern California needs to plan for saving water from the El Nino and other tropical storms that come it's way. Preserve the Delta habitat. Discard the twin tunnels plan.

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

RECIRC2949

Sincerely,

Ms. JoAnn Anglin  
5937 / 12th Ave  
Sacramento, CA 95820-2410  
(916) 451-1372  
[joannpen@comcast.net](mailto:joannpen@comcast.net)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Tom Browne <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 29, 2015 8:03 AM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 29, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

California is truly at a crossroads with this project. This use of public subsidized water to support agribusiness and unsustainable growth in southern California at the cost of major environmental damage in the northern half of the state is unconscionable. THERE HAS TO BE A BETTER WAY! The use of gray water for irrigation, conservation and holding agriculture accountable for the amount of the state's water they use (near 80%) are some of the more rational steps that need to be taken. A blank check is what Gov Brown would like to give these powers that be (developers and agribusiness). If the governor thinks that this project is part of his "legacy", it might truly become that, but for all the wrong reasons!

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted

groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Mr. Tom Browne  
1267 Filton Ct  
Fremont, CA 94536-1868  
[tw.browne@att.net](mailto:tw.browne@att.net)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Janna Caughron <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 4:20 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 27, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

I oppose the building of any dams or reservoirs or increasing the size of any existing reservoirs. I would support efforts to restore riparian habitats throughout the state. In light of the fact that the Sierra Nevada Mountains no longer receive adequate snow fall there will be no water to export south and not enough water to restore ground water levels.

I also support regulations that require low flush toilets and showerheads to be installed in all new commercial, industrial, or residential construction. I also support regulations that upon sale of a building all toilets, sinks, showers, bathtubs, etc. be replaced with low flush/flow models.

In addition I support waste management practices and technologies that would significantly reduce the current amounts of water used to manage and treat waste.

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta

water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Ms. Janna Caughron  
11260 Donner Pass Rd  
# 134  
Truckee, CA 96161-4848  
[lafayette@telis.org](mailto:lafayette@telis.org)

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of linnea Fronce & thomas Hall <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 29, 2015 8:33 AM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 29, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

WE CANNOT BELIEVE THE GOVERNMENT IS WILLING TO DESTROY THE SACRAMENTO AND SAN JOAQUIN RIVER SYSTEMS AND THEIR DELTA SO THAT OTHERS CAN WATER LAWNS, FILL SWIMMING POOLS AND GROW WATER INTENSIVE CROPS.

WE ACTUALLY WANT TO CREATE A MINIATURE (EXTINCT) COLORADO DELTA????

APPARENTLY SALMON, GREEN STURGEON, HERONS, EGRETS, DELTA FARMERS, ETC ETC ARE TOTALLY UNIMPORTANT. WHEN THE DELTA DIES ARE WSE THEN GOING TO SPEND BILLIONS MORE TO TRY TO REVIVE IT??

NO MORE SALMON RUNS, NO MORE INCOME FROM FISHERMEN. ANOTHER EXTINCT SALMON.

WHY IS SOUTHERN CA MORE IMPORTANT THAN NORTHERN CALIFORNIA?????

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural

and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Ms. linnea Fronce & thomas Hall  
991 Sagamore Way  
Sacramento, CA 95822-1712  
[wildart@dslextreme.com](mailto:wildart@dslextreme.com)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Muriel Gravina <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 7:29 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 27, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

.With forecast rises in sea level we must restore our wetlands.

Isn't this the job that BDCP has promised to do????

We must protect our Delta habitat.

Stop exporting water to Southern California. Add these comments to the letter above.

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

RECIRC 2953

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Ms. Muriel Gravina  
130 Fulton St  
Palo Alto, CA 94301-1319  
[murielgrav@yahoo.com](mailto:murielgrav@yahoo.com)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Sherry Guzzi <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 29, 2015 5:05 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 29, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

This project was originally 'sold' as being about delta restoration...

a lie. Twin tunnels will destroy the delta and empty northern California reservoirs. And all the additional reservoirs in the world won't make it rain. "Big Ag", especially all the cattle and dairy production in the San Joaquin, should not be subsidized with my tax dollars!

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

RECIRC2954

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Sherry Guzzi  
PO Box 7763  
Tahoe City, CA 96145-7763  
[tahoeguzzi@gmail.com](mailto:tahoeguzzi@gmail.com)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Tim Lazer  
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 10:59 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 28, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

It's not acceptable diverting water from Northern California to the south. We need to desalinate- not destroy the ecosystem. Also, Southern Californians waste enormous amounts of water and don't understand how critical the drought is. I personally witnessed enormous amounts of waste. Watering running down streets and rain birds operating in the middle of the wrong watering days- clueless and uncaring!

Tim Lazer

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Mr. Tim Lazer  
1925 22nd St  
Sacramento, CA 95816-7108  
(916) 615-4525  
[lazerglass@sbcglobal.net](mailto:lazerglass@sbcglobal.net)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of David Lipscomb <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 4:19 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 27, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

The Delta estuary is one of CA's most valuable natural resources.

Building the tunnels will greatly increase the intrusion of saltwater into the Delta, with disastrous results for the environment, for people, and for one of the most persecuted species in the State - our wild fish - salmon, trout, bass, striped bass - a resource just as valuable as our farms.

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

RECIRC2956

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Mr. David Lipscomb  
3341 Springhill Rd  
Lafayette, CA 94549-2533  
(925) 283-8865  
[davidlipscomb@comcast.net](mailto:davidlipscomb@comcast.net)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Piero Martinucci <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 8:01 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 27, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

.In my humble opinion, the money would be better spent on re-charging our state's aquifers. Whenever people would complain about the rain, I would answer: "means snow in the Sierra, like money in the bank". With the lack of potential for snow storage, the sensible alternative is in-ground storage, and the sooner the better, before subsidence from overdrawing reduces the storage capacity of the aquifers.

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Mr. Piero Martinucci  
1520 Holly St  
Berkeley, CA 94703-1037  
[papanooch1@comcast.net](mailto:papanooch1@comcast.net)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Jonathan McClelland <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 28, 2015 5:00 AM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 28, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

.This is primarily directed to Gov. Brown, but I encourage my local representatives to read this as well, as I have damn near given up on making the wolf in moonbeam clothes see the light regarding our most basic essential resource. Since you haven't abandoned this ridiculously expensive and incredibly destructive plan despite all the factual evidence that it is not a real solution to CA.'s water consumption makes me believe that your sustainable energy proposals are nothing more than a smoke screen to mollify conservation minded voters. All the clean KWs in the world won't do us a whit of good if we are out of water, and anyone who studies the water supply system with a pragmatic, scientific approach would conclude that deadbeat dams and conveyance systems are not a part of the solution in the 21st century.

We have a serious groundwater overdraft situation, and the best the legislature can come up with is a plan that takes over 25 years to implement makes me want to spit nails and bile. A saner way to spend massive \$\$\$ is to implement a groundwater recharge program NOW. This is serious a threat to our future as climate change is, or as Hitler and Hirohito were 75 years ago. We had the political and social will to confront that threat with urgency, and now, despite all our

technological advances we come up with a 25 year plan that doesn't address climate appropriate crops and permits drilling new wells that exacerbate the situation.

Governor, it is time for you to give up on your Daddy's dream to suck our state dry to benefit a few overly subsidized water wasters.

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Mr. Jonathan McClelland  
4740 Hall Rd  
Santa Rosa, CA 95401-5633  
[jonsonario@comcast.net](mailto:jonsonario@comcast.net)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Keith Miller  
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 5:59 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 27, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

Rather than build these ridiculous tunnels, CA should prepare and execute a water policy which addresses 21st century needs and values.

This includes but is not limited to:

- 1) ending corporate welfare in the form of water subsidies
- 2) eliminating overseas water exportation in the form of alfalfa and other water intensive crops
- 3) recognizing CA is a desert and encouraging water use accordingly
- 4) acknowledging evaporation loss and assigning cost to this for future surface projects
- 5) covering the existing State and Federal canals
- 6) purchasing the Westlands Water District and shutting it down
- 7) implementing new conservation programs such as mandatory toilet replacement and rebates; no ag water for flooding fields; no urban water for lawns
- 8) punish water wasters and cheaters

The tunnels are NOT NEEDED, are WASTEFUL, and, if built, will PERPETUATE 19th CENTURY BANKRUPT THINKING!

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Mr. Keith Miller  
409 Water St  
Oakland, CA 94607-3740  
510 893 7833 x19  
[keith@calkayak.com](mailto:keith@calkayak.com)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of bruce moore <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 6:34 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 27, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

I believe that the growth in the population of CA will require more diligent preservation of the wilderness, including the rivers and the wetlands.

I want my children and grandchildren to enjoy these opportunities and practice more conservation rather than undertake these projects.

It is unconscionable to see cotton and other crops grown in CA that consume far too much of our precious water. Why isn't this being addressed adequately.

The farmers of the Central Valley have far too much political power; and their voice appears to be more important than the rest of the citizens of this fine State.

It's time to address this.

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Mr. Bruce Moore  
26185 Dolores St  
Carmel, CA 93923-9247  
(831) 622-0292  
[twinman10@gmail.com](mailto:twinman10@gmail.com)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Graeme Plant <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 5:40 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 27, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

Before we move forward on any water infrastructure projects, we need to stop and reprice the water the federal and state projects are already delivering. Subsidizing water as we do today only encourages wasting water. Pricing should include the cost of changing the natural ecosystem that harms other uses (e.g. salmon fisheries, recreation). Until we make this change we will continue down a path of patching a fundamentally broken system.

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Mr. Graeme Plant  
111 Haswell Ct  
Auburn, CA 95603-4411  
[graeme.plant@gmail.com](mailto:graeme.plant@gmail.com)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Barbara Schmidt <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 5:29 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 27, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

My family has lived, farmed and ranched in the Delta for over 100 years. The Delta has some of the richest farmland in the world and is essential to the health of San Francisco Bay and wildlife.

Sending Delta water to the arid south is not only costly but will ruin a unique environment.

Sending water to farm the arid farmland is ridiculous since after a few years of irrigation the soil turns saline. Only large agriculture interests in pursuit of fast money will profit. Also if the population of Southern California cannot or will not conserve water then they and Big Ag should pay for recycling their existing water or paying for desalination of ocean water.

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted

groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Ms. Barbara Schmidt  
PO Box 1984  
San Andreas, CA 95249-1984  
(209) 754-0850  
[brucebarb11@gmail.com](mailto:brucebarb11@gmail.com)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Gary sims <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 29, 2015 6:06 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 29, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

If you rob the delta of it's water resource, than we will have a complete unbalance of the nature of things. When ever we change the balance we pay a dear price in the long run. History has shown this and this is why we voice our information to you about what the end results of such projects will do to damage the environment. But, blind eyes do not want to evaluate history because it does not agree with it's personal agendas. Excuses can be made for why we need these tunnels, but they are not valid enough to justify the supposed need.

What is more important is what will happen to the delta and the other rivers feeding it. The effect will be great. You might say "we need the tunnels because of the drought" but drought situations are why we don't need them. Look at how the Delta already suffers because of the less water flow from the slower rivers brackish water further up stream. Do you want to create another San Joaquin river.

Once a mighty river that now loses it's natural flow. We tried to save it with a canal re-feeding it with delta water that is a non natural brackish water which now disrupts the natural habitat, not to mention bad water imported for farmers crops. History, history, history! Look at it and make a real evaluation of what damage will result from the tunnels. You tried to appease the concerns with promises of protecting the environment in the bill but just because promises are in a

bill doesn't make the overall bill right. Now with the additions and omissions of the tunnel proposals today there is a complete lack of concern for the safety of the delta. There is no excuse for the destruction of our delta no matter how small the effect is as you purport. Pull your proverbial heads out of the sand and make true evaluations of historical data. The sand your heads could end up in is the sand of a dried up delta.

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Mr. Gary sims  
2634 Arlington ct turlock ca 95382  
1634 Arlington ct  
turlock, CA 95382-0779  
(951) 907-1446  
[garyesims@msn.com](mailto:garyesims@msn.com)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Robert Smay <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 29, 2015 6:04 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 29, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

.This is another case of big contributors receiving special consideration at the expense of taxpayers, in this case, Central Valley agribusiness, and the insatiable builders and developers in Southern California. It must cease. Stop the theft NOW!

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Mr. Robert Smay  
PO Box 1021  
Lotus, CA 95651-1021  
(530) 295-8271  
[robedonn@pacbell.net](mailto:robedonn@pacbell.net)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Ron Smith <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 28, 2015 12:29 AM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 28, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

.Do not let the large water users take even more than they do now. Let your legacy of serving all of California stand for your principles, not just the demands of big agriculture. Please save our rivers from the over planting of agriculture requiring more water than the state has to give without harmful effects to our fish and wildlife.

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Mr. Ron Smith  
34350 Corum Ct  
Union City, CA 94587-4415  
[4ronsmith@gmail.com](mailto:4ronsmith@gmail.com)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Dan Towers <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 6:34 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 27, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

No on new construction costs and habitat rehab. A moratorium on water hookup and re-aligning the grandfathered water usage south of the Sacramento Delta FIRST, is better math.

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Mr. Dan Towers  
12811 Lakeview Dr  
Clearlake Oaks, CA 95423  
[wweye@mchsi.com](mailto:wweye@mchsi.com)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Sherri Venezia <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 4:33 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 27, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

There are so many significant reasons to oppose this project: moral, environmental, habitat preservation, ecosystem coordination, farming, and water availability for those in Northern California, both for public and private uses..... that it is boggling. It is simply wrong to transfer water to Southern California when there are no modifications of the use of it there.....no moratorium on building, no prevention of overuse for water intensive crops, no provision for re-sale of precious water rights....this is simply taking it by the powerful and rich. Untenable!

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Ms. Sherri Venezia  
39718 Barry Rd  
Davis, CA 95616-9416  
[sher@omsoft.com](mailto:sher@omsoft.com)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of David Wikander <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 4:12 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 27, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

.It's way past time to stop using tax payer dollars for projects like this that cater to special interest groups and leave our precious environment compromised. As our population grows the need and desire for natural environments will expand not diminish. This project is foolish.

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Mr. David Wikander  
4040 Cherryvale Ave  
Soquel, CA 95073-9560  
[davidw@baymoon.com](mailto:davidw@baymoon.com)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Linda Woodward <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 6:34 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 27, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

I find it hard to believe that this project is even being considered.

Northern California can not afford to send more of its water south. I see there must be political pull involved as this project would decimate major portions of Northern California. It's not like we have an excess of water. As a fourth generation Northern Californian, I would hate to see this area destroyed by the BDCP project. Even the name is deceptive. The suggestions below are a much better approach to the lack of water.

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Ms. Linda Woodward  
3 Rolling Green Cir  
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523-3266  
[lfactotum@aol.com](mailto:lfactotum@aol.com)

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Melinda Wright <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 6:59 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 27, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

.If we are serious about long term water solutions, we need to divert every penny of those BDCP billions to water recycling, conservation technology, groundwater re-charge, and other practical and ethical steps. Can we please, please get that done before we crash the Delta ecosystem?

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

RECIRC2970

Sincerely,

Ms. Melinda Wright  
PO Box 225  
Groveland, CA 95321-0225  
[melindawright@juno.com](mailto:melindawright@juno.com)

---

**From:** KnowWho Services <noreply@knowwho.services>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 28, 2015 8:48 AM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** Stop the California WaterFix - Review Alternatives That Will Protect the Delta

Dear BDCP/California WaterFix Comments,

Dear Resources Agency,

The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta.

Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally.

This project is no better than the peripheral canal of earlier times. No water should be reallocated to southern California, until all citizens of the state practice excellent water conservation, including personal reclamation of gray water to water one's property.

Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually protect the Delta.

Sincerely,

Salzman  
1437 Josephine St  
Berkeley, CA 94703-  
[vickisalzman@gmail.com](mailto:vickisalzman@gmail.com)  
(510) 525-6409