

From: Food & Water Watch <act@fwwatch.org> on behalf of Al Mannon <act@fwwatch.org>
Sent: Sunday, June 22, 2014 2:10 PM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: I Oppose the BDCP

Jun 22, 2014

Ryan Wulff
650 Capitol Mall. Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Wulff,

I am concerned and alarmed by the proposal for the new tunnel project to redirect water from the Sacramento River.

I am concerned that the cost of this project will not be shared equitably by the beneficiaries of the project. Those that will receive the water should pay the cost. Those promoting the project claim it is environmentally sound. Shipping enormous amounts of water away from the Delta sounds more like a huge environmental risk, not a benefit.

Even if this project can be shown to be environmentally sound, given the fragile state of the economy, it seems to me that this is not a good time to embark on such expensive projects.

I understand that similar projects have provided little or no benefit to the general public.

Overall, the tunnels are unnecessary and fiscally irresponsible. The existing aquaduct could be reinforced and other local water projects like rainwater collection could be implemented instead, providing a much greater benefit at a lower cost.

Sincerely,

Mr. Al Mannon
2930 Driftwood Pl
Stockton, CA 95219-8024

From: Food & Water Watch <act@fwwatch.org> on behalf of Mike and Gwen McKenzie <act@fwwatch.org>
Sent: Sunday, June 22, 2014 2:09 PM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: I Oppose the BDCP

Jun 22, 2014

Ryan Wulff
650 Capitol Mall. Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Wulff,

I am concerned and alarmed by the proposal for the new tunnel project to redirect water from the Sacramento River.

This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our state cannot afford it. [An entire river should not be redirected for the sake of large-scale Corporate Agriculture Welfare Queens who depend on taxpayer financed subsidies to export high value (to them) nut crops to China. They are taking California's limited water and basically shipping it overseas for self enrichment. Allowing this to go forward is tantamount to cutting ones own throat, period. Sop the insanity, Please!

Overall, the tunnels are unnecessary and fiscally irresponsible. The existing aquaduct could be reinforced and other local water projects like rainwater collection could be implemented instead, providing a much greater benefit at a lower cost.

Sincerely,

Mr. Mike and Gwen McKenzie
6597 Cane Ln
Valley Springs, CA 95252-9547

From: Food & Water Watch <act@fwwatch.org> on behalf of Sue Bordelon
<act@fwwatch.org>
Sent: Sunday, June 22, 2014 2:09 PM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: I Oppose the BDCP

Jun 22, 2014

Ryan Wulff
650 Capitol Mall. Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Wulff,

I am concerned and alarmed by the proposal for the new tunnel project to redirect water from the Sacramento River.

As a small farmer, environmental engineer, past city planner and concerned citizen of the this state, I know how clean water is quickly becoming the next oil, the next resource that will determine where we live, what we eat, and who is going to make money from it.

This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our state cannot afford it. An entire river should not be redirected for the sake of large-scale, unmetered agriculture and the oil industry.

The proposed tunnels have already been rejected by voters in 1982, and similar tunnel projects in places like Santa Barbara County have not been cost effective and have provided little benefit to taxpayers.

Overall, the tunnels are unnecessary and fiscally irresponsible. The existing aquaduct could be reinforced and other local water projects like rainwater collection could be implemented instead, providing a much greater benefit at a lower cost.

Sincerely,

Ms. Sue Bordelon
6316 Wells Ave
Loomis, CA 95650-9302

From: Food & Water Watch <act@fwwatch.org> on behalf of Deborah Janzen
<act@fwwatch.org>
Sent: Sunday, June 22, 2014 2:09 PM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: I Oppose the BDCP

Jun 22, 2014

Ryan Wulff
650 Capitol Mall. Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Wulff,

I am concerned and alarmed by the proposal for the new tunnel project to redirect water from the Sacramento River.

This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our state cannot afford it. An entire river should not be redirected for the sake of large-scale, unmetered agriculture and the oil industry.

The proposed tunnels have already been rejected by voters in 1982, and similar tunnel projects in places like Santa Barbara County have not been cost effective and have provided little benefit to taxpayers.

[This project has the potential to be devastating to farming and wild life in the Delta. Find a difference solution, asap.]

Overall, the tunnels are unnecessary and fiscally irresponsible. The existing aquaduct could be reinforced and other local water projects like rainwater collection could be implemented instead, providing a much greater benefit at a lower cost.

Sincerely,

Ms. Deborah Janzen
805 S Rose St
Lodi, CA 95240-4624

From: Food & Water Watch <act@fwwatch.org> on behalf of Margaret Harrell <act@fwwatch.org>
Sent: Sunday, June 22, 2014 2:09 PM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: I Oppose the BDCP

Jun 22, 2014

Ryan Wulff
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Wulff,

I am concerned and alarmed by the proposal for the new tunnel project to redirect water from the Sacramento River.

As a person of faith and a grandmother, I strongly appose this project.

We are called to be husbands of creation, so we should support what benefits the many, not the few. This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our state cannot afford it. An entire river should not be redirected for the sake of large-scale, unmetered agriculture and the oil industry.

The proposed tunnels have already been rejected by voters in 1982, and similar tunnel projects in places like Santa Barbara County have not been cost effective and have provided little benefit to taxpayers.

Overall, the tunnels are unnecessary and fiscally irresponsible. The existing aquaduct could be reinforced and other local water projects like rainwater collection could be implemented instead, providing a much greater benefit at a lower cost.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Margaret Harrell
514-24th St.
Hermosa Beach, CA 90254-2617

From: Food & Water Watch <act@fwwatch.org> on behalf of Barry Katz <act@fwwatch.org>
Sent: Sunday, June 22, 2014 1:40 PM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: I Oppose the BDCP

Jun 22, 2014

Ryan Wulff
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Wulff,

I am concerned and alarmed by the proposal for the new tunnel project to redirect water from the Sacramento River.

This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our state cannot afford it. An entire river should not be redirected for the sake of large-scale, unmetered agriculture and the oil industry.

The proposed tunnels have already been rejected by voters in 1982, and similar tunnel projects in places like Santa Barbara County have not been cost effective and have provided little benefit to taxpayers.

Obviously, cost is not a consideration because it is the consumer and taxpayers who will pay for it, not the primary benefactors.

It's very obvious that corporate interests control our State. But in drought-stricken California, this is tantamount to complete disregard for the public welfare. At least pretend to care about people by stopping this expensive project that will only be beneficial to only the oil and agriculture corporate interests. It is a shame it has gotten this far to date. Cut it out!

Overall, the tunnels are unnecessary and fiscally irresponsible. The existing aquaduct could be reinforced and other local water projects like rainwater collection could be implemented instead, providing a much greater benefit at a lower cost.

Sincerely,

Mr. Barry Katz
904 N Spaulding Ave Apt 2
West Hollywood, CA 90046-6349

From: Food & Water Watch <act@fwwatch.org> on behalf of john bidleman
<act@fwwatch.org>
Sent: Sunday, June 22, 2014 1:39 PM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: I Oppose the BDCP

Jun 22, 2014

Ryan Wulff
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Wulff,

I am concerned and alarmed by the proposal for the new tunnel project to redirect water from the Sacramento River.

This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our state cannot afford it. An entire river should not be redirected for the sake of large-scale, unmetered agriculture and the oil industry.

The proposed tunnels have already been rejected by voters in 1982, and similar tunnel projects in places like Santa Barbara County have not been cost effective and have provided little benefit to taxpayers.

Please stop the incorporation of more government. This is the hijacking of taxpayers taxes. Please represent the people who elected you.

Overall, the tunnels are unnecessary and fiscally irresponsible. The existing aquaduct could be reinforced and other local water projects like rainwater collection could be implemented instead, providing a much greater benefit at a lower cost.

Sincerely,

Mr. john bidleman
4380 Daywalt Rd
Sebastopol, CA 95472-6011

From: Food & Water Watch <act@fwwatch.org> on behalf of Tom Nichelson
<act@fwwatch.org>
Sent: Sunday, June 22, 2014 1:39 PM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: I Oppose the BDCP

Jun 22, 2014

Ryan Wulff
650 Capitol Mall. Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Wulff,

I am concerned and alarmed by the proposal for the new tunnel project to redirect water from the Sacramento River.

This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our state cannot afford it. An entire river should not be redirected for the sake of large-scale, unmetered agriculture and the oil industry.

The proposed tunnels have already been rejected by voters in 1982, and similar tunnel projects in places like Santa Barbara County have not been cost effective and have provided little benefit to taxpayers.

I don't care how many voters they have in the southland! How about a more sensible conservation plan where the pain is felt equally across the citizenry.

Unlimited water in Sacramento? Cotton subsidies that are excessive for a surplus crop that doesn't put healthy food on anyone's plate. We've been down this road. I like and generally admire the Governor, but how can this possibly fly alongside his desire for high-speed rail? We need to keep in mind that infrastructure upgrades are crucial for our state's future, but these projects must be prioritized for greatest impact on base needs of the majority.

Overall, the tunnels are unnecessary and fiscally irresponsible. The existing aquaduct could be reinforced and other local water projects like rainwater collection could be implemented instead, providing a much greater benefit at a lower cost.

Sincerely,

Mr. Tom Nichelson
1254 Quiet Cir
Concord, CA 94521-4840

From: Food & Water Watch <act@fwwatch.org> on behalf of Sherry Meddick
<act@fwwatch.org>
Sent: Sunday, June 22, 2014 1:39 PM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: I Oppose the BDCP

Jun 22, 2014

Ryan Wulff
650 Capitol Mall. Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Wulff,

I am concerned and alarmed by the proposal for the new tunnel project to redirect water from the Sacramento River.

This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our state cannot afford it. An entire river should not be redirected for the sake of large-scale, unmetered agriculture and the oil industry.

The proposed tunnels have already been rejected by voters in 1982, and similar tunnel projects in places like Santa Barbara County have not been cost effective and have provided little benefit to taxpayers.

I am opposed to diverting ONE DROP of water from the Delta.

I am opposed to diverting water from N. Cal in order to give the water to frackers and giant agro.

I am sick and tired of being required to support measures that help corporations but harm ME.

Overall, the tunnels are unnecessary and fiscally irresponsible. The existing aquaduct could be reinforced and other local water projects like rainwater collection could be implemented instead, providing a much greater benefit at a lower cost.

Sincerely,

Ms. Sherry Meddick
PO Box 771
Silverado, CA 92676-0771

From: Food & Water Watch <act@fwwatch.org> on behalf of Ellen Barron
<act@fwwatch.org>
Sent: Sunday, June 22, 2014 1:10 PM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: I Oppose the BDCP

Jun 22, 2014

Ryan Wulff
650 Capitol Mall. Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Wulff,

I am concerned and alarmed by the proposal for the new tunnel project to redirect water from the Sacramento River.

This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our state cannot afford it. An entire river should not be redirected for the sake of large-scale, unmetered agriculture and the oil industry.

The proposed tunnels have already been rejected by voters in 1982, and similar tunnel projects in places like Santa Barbara County have not been cost effective and have provided little benefit to taxpayers.

Whoring for big Ag and big oil is a crime against Californians. Stop taking dirty money.

Overall, the tunnels are unnecessary and fiscally irresponsible. The existing aquaduct could be reinforced and other local water projects like rainwater collection could be implemented instead, providing a much greater benefit at a lower cost.

Sincerely,

Ms. Ellen Barron
55 Quail Dr
Santa Cruz, CA 95060-9756

From: vic <vrosasco@clearwire.net>
Sent: Monday, June 30, 2014 6:23 AM
To: bdcpc.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: pipes

To BDCP

Since the inception of the central valley water project I have watched the Delata decline, and this new segment will accelerate it. Too much water is removed from the Delta now and making it easier to remove more in the future is not going to help no matter how you try to spin it off as helping out the estuary. The plan to set aside 100,000 acres for wildlife habitat is simply a ruse to get the flow that keeps out salt water in that end of the delta and if nobody is farming this ground, nobody is complaining. Sure you say that science will drive the decisions on how much water to divert, but the same science is available now and is ignored. It is fact that no more than 3m. acre ft. of water should be removed on a normal rainfall year but this year over 6.5m.ac.ft. have been shipped south. If completed this project will only make this easier.

I also believe the process for promoting this project is totally corrupt, I am incensed that a supposedly public project is being advertised using taxpayer funds. The Dept. of Water Recources has ben turned into a talking head for the water groups promoting this project which is a perfect case of the fox designing the henhouse. Your estimate of project cost is ridiculously low to sell the project to the public and inconclusive of how much taxpayers have to pay for the wildlife mitigation cost, which if fact should be paid by the benefactors of this, not the public, This project only benifits a small public segment, it is designed to benefit large corporate farming interests and water brokers. So I will do everything in my power to stop this example of corrupt California politics that benefits a special interest while throwing the general public under the bus.

Sincerely,

Victor Rosasco
1708 Woodsbro Rd.
Stockton Ca. 95206
209-479-4500

From: Food & Water Watch <act@fwwatch.org> on behalf of Ananda Patterson
<act@fwwatch.org>
Sent: Saturday, June 21, 2014 10:37 AM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: I Oppose the BDCP

Jun 21, 2014

Ryan Wulff
650 Capitol Mall. Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Wulff,

I am concerned and alarmed by the proposal for the new tunnel project to redirect water from the Sacramento River.

This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our state cannot afford it. An entire river should not be redirected for the sake of large-scale, unmetered agriculture and the oil industry.

The proposed tunnels have already been rejected by voters in 1982, and similar tunnel projects in places like Santa Barbara County have not been cost effective and have provided little benefit to taxpayers.

It's time to focus on sustainable water development in California -- increasing capture and storage capacity, reducing runoff and waste, and implementing more robust conservation measures. Building tunnels to ship massive quantities of water that we don't have doesn't make sense.

Overall, the tunnels are unnecessary and fiscally irresponsible. The existing aquaduct could be reinforced and other local water projects like rainwater collection could be implemented instead, providing a much greater benefit at a lower cost.

Sincerely,

Ms. Ananda Patterson
320 Napa St
Rodeo, CA 94572-1330

From: Food & Water Watch <act@fwwatch.org> on behalf of Jea Bressie <act@fwwatch.org>
Sent: Friday, June 20, 2014 5:59 PM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: I Oppose the BDCP

Jun 20, 2014

Ryan Wulff
650 Capitol Mall. Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Wulff,

I am concerned and alarmed by the proposal for the new tunnel project to redirect water from the Sacramento River.

This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our state cannot afford it. An entire river should not be redirected for the sake of large-scale, unmetered agriculture and the oil industry.

The proposed tunnels have already been rejected by voters in 1982, and similar tunnel projects in places like Santa Barbara County have not been cost effective and have provided little benefit to taxpayers.

Stop the water waste of fracking and then let's talk Agibusiness is also a big drain on waning water supplies .No more wasting please .

Overall, the tunnels are unnecessary and fiscally irresponsible. The existing aquaduct could be reinforced and other local water projects like rainwater collection could be implemented instead, providing a much greater benefit at a lower cost.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Jea Bressie
720 Beaver St Apt E
Santa Rosa, CA 95404-3747

From: Food & Water Watch <act@fwwatch.org> on behalf of Judith Kahle
<act@fwwatch.org>
Sent: Friday, June 20, 2014 3:29 PM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: I Oppose the BDCP

Jun 20, 2014

Ryan Wulff
650 Capitol Mall. Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Wulff,

I am concerned and alarmed by the proposal for the new tunnel project to redirect water from the Sacramento River.

This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our state cannot afford it. An entire river should not be redirected for the sake of large-scale, unmetered agriculture and the oil industry.

The proposed tunnels have already been rejected by voters in 1982, and similar tunnel projects in places like Santa Barbara County have not been cost effective and have provided little benefit to taxpayers.

We are in the worst drought in centuries. Northern California cannot afford to lose its water to southern California big agriculture and oil industry. This is OUR state, OUR water, OUR wildlife that depends upon water to live.

Overall, the tunnels are unnecessary and fiscally irresponsible. The existing aquaduct could be reinforced and other local water projects like rainwater collection could be implemented instead, providing a much greater benefit at a lower cost.

Sincerely,

Ms. Judith Kahle
343 Wyoming St
Fairfield, CA 94533-5146

From: Food & Water Watch <act@fwwatch.org> on behalf of Gonzo Rock
<act@fwwatch.org>
Sent: Friday, June 20, 2014 2:58 PM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: I Oppose the BDCP

Jun 20, 2014

Ryan Wulff
650 Capitol Mall. Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Wulff,

I am concerned and alarmed by the proposal for the new tunnel project to redirect water from the Sacramento River.

Consider the environmental consequences of diverting massive amounts of water like this. Aren't we killing our planet hard enough already?

We should instead be capturing our rain water that just flows out to sea in Los Angeles storm drains... it should instead percolate back down into the water table.

Overall, the tunnels are unnecessary and fiscally irresponsible. The existing aquaduct could be reinforced and other local water projects like rainwater collection could be implemented instead, providing a much greater benefit at a lower cost.

Sincerely,

Mr. Gonzo Rock
800 Main St
Venice, CA 90291-3218

From: Food & Water Watch <act@fwwatch.org> on behalf of Nancy Parker
<act@fwwatch.org>
Sent: Saturday, June 21, 2014 10:57 AM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: I Oppose the BDCP

Jun 21, 2014

Ryan Wulff
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Wulff,

I am concerned and alarmed by the proposal for the new tunnel project to redirect water from the Sacramento River.

This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our state cannot afford it. An entire river should not be redirected for the sake of large-scale, unmetered agriculture and the oil industry.

The proposed tunnels have already been rejected by voters in 1982, and similar tunnel projects in places like Santa Barbara County have not been cost effective and have provided little benefit to taxpayers.

There are viable alternatives to meeting the water needs of our state.

Please do not succumb to pressure or ill-advised logic leading to the approval of tunnels. Environmental coalitions of many stripes are ready to help plan a successful alternative to tunnels.

Thank you for your consideration.

Overall, the tunnels are unnecessary and fiscally irresponsible. The existing aquaduct could be reinforced and other local water projects like rainwater collection could be implemented instead, providing a much greater benefit at a lower cost.

Sincerely,

Ms. Nancy Parker
1512 MLK
Berkeley, CA 94709

From: Food & Water Watch <act@fwwatch.org> on behalf of Carolyn Scarr
<act@fwwatch.org>
Sent: Saturday, June 21, 2014 10:38 AM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: I Oppose the BDCP

Jun 21, 2014

Ryan Wulff
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Wulff,

I am concerned and alarmed by the proposal for the new tunnel project to redirect water from the Sacramento River.

This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our state cannot afford it. An entire river should not be redirected for the sake of large-scale, unmetered agriculture and the oil industry.

The proposed tunnels have already been rejected by voters in 1982, and similar tunnel projects in places like Santa Barbara County have not been cost effective and have provided little benefit to taxpayers.

We in California do not want the peripheral canal whether above ground or in a tunnel. We do not want to ship more water to greedy misusers of the state's water to grow cash crops that use too much water and to frack for oil -- which is damaging to ground water.

No tunnel, not shipping water south.

Californians know "water is for fighting". We will fight.

Overall, the tunnels are unnecessary and fiscally irresponsible. The existing aquaduct could be reinforced and other local water projects like rainwater collection could be implemented instead, providing a much greater benefit at a lower cost.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Carolyn Scarr
1340 Ada St
Berkeley, CA 94702-1102

From: Food & Water Watch <act@fwwatch.org> on behalf of Elaine Belle <act@fwwatch.org>
Sent: Saturday, June 21, 2014 10:51 AM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: I Oppose the BDCP

Jun 21, 2014

Ryan Wulff
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Wulff,

I am concerned and alarmed by the proposal for the new tunnel project to redirect water from the Sacramento River.

WITH THE SHORTAGE OF WATTER WE NEED TO STOP WASTEFUL USE OF WATER.

There are other ways to get our energy needs met. And Big Ag needs to fnd other ways to make use of the water they have. Not be so wasteful with it. We need to pause and really asses the possibilities not plunge into this This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our state cannot afford it. An entire river should not be redirected for the sake of large-scale, unmetered agriculture and the oil industry.

The proposed tunnels have already been rejected by voters in 1982, and similar tunnel projects in places like Santa Barbara County have not been cost effective and have provided little benefit to taxpayers.

Overall, the tunnels are unnecessary and fiscally irresponsible. The existing aquaduct could be reinforced and other local water projects like rainwater collection could be implemented instead, providing a much greater benefit at a lower cost.

Sincerely,

Ms. Elaine Belle
415 Wellesley Ave
Mill Valley, CA 94941-3713

From: Food & Water Watch <act@fwwatch.org> on behalf of Martin Iseri <act@fwwatch.org>
Sent: Saturday, June 21, 2014 10:51 AM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: I Oppose the BDCP

Jun 21, 2014

Ryan Wulff
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Wulff,

I am concerned and alarmed by the proposal for the new tunnel project to redirect water from the Sacramento River.

This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our state cannot afford it. An entire river should not be redirected for the sake of large-scale, unmetered agriculture and the oil industry.

The proposed tunnels have already been rejected by voters in 1982, and similar tunnel projects in places like Santa Barbara County have not been cost effective and have provided little benefit to taxpayers.

I also object to the name of the plan. Since when does water removal help conserve the flora and fauna of the region? If large-scale agricultural enterprises and the oil industry need water, let them invest in Pacific Ocean water desalinization (and let them fund it).

Overall, the tunnels are unnecessary and fiscally irresponsible. The existing aquaduct could be reinforced and other local water projects like rainwater collection could be implemented instead, providing a much greater benefit at a lower cost.

Sincerely,

Mr. Martin Iseri
4267 Bannister Rd
Fair Oaks, CA 95628-6916

From: Food & Water Watch <act@fwwatch.org> on behalf of carole glosenger <act@fwwatch.org>
Sent: Saturday, June 21, 2014 10:48 AM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: I Oppose the BDCP

Jun 21, 2014

Ryan Wulff
650 Capitol Mall. Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Wulff,

I am concerned and alarmed by the proposal for the new tunnel project to redirect water from the Sacramento River.

This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our state cannot afford it. An entire river should not be redirected for the sake of large-scale, unmetered agriculture and the oil industry.

Farms need to adapt to changing climate and grow products that use less water.

The proposed tunnels have already been rejected by voters in 1982, and similar tunnel projects in places like Santa Barbara County have not been cost effective and have provided little benefit to taxpayers.

Also, I resent sending water to communities in Southern California that don't conserve water. We in Northern CA have been conserving water for many years while in LA people are watering lush gardens and maintaining swimming pools. Water conservation should be based on gallons per household not just a small reduction from previous over use.

Carole Glosenger

Overall, the tunnels are unnecessary and fiscally irresponsible. The existing aquaduct could be reinforced and other local water projects like rainwater collection could be implemented instead, providing a much greater benefit at a lower cost.

Sincerely,

Ms. carole glosenger
117 Beulah St
San Francisco, CA 94117-2717

From: Food & Water Watch <act@fwwatch.org> on behalf of Judy Kinter <act@fwwatch.org>
Sent: Saturday, June 21, 2014 10:55 AM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: I Oppose the BDCP

Jun 21, 2014

Ryan Wulff
650 Capitol Mall, Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Wulff,

I am concerned and alarmed by the proposal for the new tunnel project to redirect water from the Sacramento River.

This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our state cannot afford it. An entire river should not be redirected for the sake of large-scale, unmetered agriculture and the oil industry.

The proposed tunnels have already been rejected by voters in 1982, and similar tunnel projects in places like Santa Barbara County have not been cost effective and have provided little benefit to taxpayers.

What, by the way, happened to the desalination plants? I know they were built and functioning at one time. Why aren't we using them?

Overall, the tunnels are unnecessary and fiscally irresponsible. The existing aquaduct could be reinforced and other local water projects like rainwater collection could be implemented instead, providing a much greater benefit at a lower cost.

Sincerely,

Ms. Judy Kinter
2207 Mulberry St
Chico, CA 95928-6760

From: Food & Water Watch <act@fwwatch.org> on behalf of Jan Saxton <act@fwwatch.org>
Sent: Saturday, June 21, 2014 10:47 AM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: I Oppose the BDCP

Jun 21, 2014

Ryan Wulff
650 Capitol Mall. Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Wulff,

I am concerned and alarmed by the proposal for the new tunnel project to redirect water from the Sacramento River.

This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our state cannot afford it. An entire river should not be redirected for the sake of large-scale, unmetered agriculture and the oil industry.

The Sacramento Delta is already in danger of salt water intrusion due to overuse of water and diversion to other areas. It is sheer insanity to risk the most productive, fertile farmland in the state by draining more water from the delta.

The proposed tunnels have already been rejected by voters in 1982, and similar tunnel projects in places like Santa Barbara County have not been cost effective and have provided little benefit to taxpayers.

Overall, the tunnels are unnecessary and fiscally irresponsible. The existing aquaduct could be reinforced and other local water projects like rainwater collection could be implemented instead, providing a much greater benefit at a lower cost.

Sincerely,

Ms. Jan Saxton
3860a Anzar Rd
Aromas, CA 95004-9625

From: Food & Water Watch <act@fwwatch.org> on behalf of Carole Ehrhardt
<act@fwwatch.org>
Sent: Saturday, June 21, 2014 10:54 AM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: I Oppose the BDCP

Jun 21, 2014

Ryan Wulff
650 Capitol Mall. Suite 5-100
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Wulff,

I am concerned and alarmed by the proposal for the new tunnel project to redirect water from the Sacramento River.

Already Sacramento has shipped a huge amount of Northern California water to the Central Valley and Southern California. Here in Northern California, we are suffering from lack of water and farmers in the Central Valley are farming where there is no water and farms should never have been built. This is desert and the rest of us should not be expected to subsidize their growth. Also so many farms have been added that ones who were there before the Aquaduct do not have enough water for their crops. This has to stop. Add this to the current fracking craze and a good portion of California will end up with no water or poisoned water.

This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our state cannot afford it. An entire river should not be redirected for the sake of large-scale, unmetered agriculture and the oil industry. The Nature Conservancy and others have made improvements to the Sacramento River and we need this river. To ship its water south is wrong!

The proposed tunnels have already been rejected by voters in 1982, and similar tunnel projects in places like Santa Barbara County have not been cost effective and have provided little benefit to taxpayers.

The citizens of California do not want you to subsidize more areas and/or the greedy oil companies while we pay for it. You have done a decent job of balancing our budget. Lets put some money back into education so we can be better prepared for our future, not into more Central Valley(AKA desert) areas and the oil companies.

Overall, the tunnels are unnecessary and fiscally irresponsible. The existing aquaduct could be reinforced and other local water projects like rainwater collection could be implemented instead, providing a much greater benefit at a lower cost.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Carole Ehrhardt
PO Box 243
Pebble Beach, CA 93953-0243

