

From: Evan Jones <revwin@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 8:10 PM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: twin tunnels

This is a hugely expensive solution to a simple problem...slow the planting of agricultural crops that require 80% of CA's water.

Evan Jones

From: Endless Summer <endlesssummer42@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 8:50 PM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Comments about the BDCP Plan

Dear BDCP/NOAA Representatives,

Regarding the Delta Tunnels and the incredible expense of the construction and maintenance of them to supply the increasing water demands of Southern California, it would be reasonable to ask that an unbiased comparison to the installation and operation of a desalinization plant has been considered. With Southern California so close to the clear blue water of the ocean (unlike the sediment ridden waters of Northern California and the bay/Delta region) it does not make much sense to incur the costs of these additional tunnels and their maintenance much less the destruction of land and marine ecosystems. There are already pipelines from the Delta region to Southern California which are obviously unsustainable. Cabo San Lucas, Mexico has been using modular desalinization technology to make clean drinking water from the ocean for 10+ years with claims of 95% efficiency and is modular to keep up with increased future demand. Please check out their web site at <http://www.energyrecovery.com/cabo-san-lucas-desalination-plant-mexico> Desalinization technology is proving its sustainability in other countries. Shouldn't this kind of science be utilized in California, a front-runner in technological advancement?

Thank you for your consideration

Deeply Concerned Voter,
David Opheim

From: Skiprett <skiprett@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 8:51 PM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Tunnels

I see no reason to send more water to SoCal. I watched the news today & saw water being totally wasted. I understand it was broken pipe but it makes no difference to me. We use our water to support crop growth to keep our farmers in business. We cannot water crops with salt water & without our farmers, everyone in the state will be in trouble. The salmon and other fish will die, wildlife will suffer, and on & on.....I think so cal should look into desalination programs.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Carla Blair <carlblair@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 8:54 PM
To: bdcpc comments - NOAA Service Account
Subject: Re: Comment on the Draft BDCP and Draft EIR/EIS Re: Not want the tunnels please

Sorry don't want the tunnels

Sent from my iPad

On Jul 29, 2014, at 8:26 PM, "bdcpc comments - NOAA Service Account" <bdcpc.comments@noaa.gov> wrote:

Thank you for submitting a formal comment on the Draft BDCP and Draft EIR/EIS. All comments received on the Draft EIR/EIS will be considered in the Final EIR/EIS and decision-making process. For more information, assistance in locating the documents or if you have special needs, contact 866-924-9955. Additional information can be found at www.baydeltaconservationplan.com

From: John Anderson <captaingort.jra@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 8:56 PM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Please do something else!

Please let the Sacramento River flow through the entire Delta before it is pumped south. Instead of the tunnels, create a core superlevee channel and greatly improved fish screens at Byron. Install an anti-back flow gate as used in Europe to prevent saltwater back flow during any emergency. The flow of ample fresh flushing water through the Delta absolutely vital to the health of the Delta's ecosystem and economic health. The Delta is a treasure for all Californians- indeed, all Americans- and must be preserved and restored. The Peripheral Tunnel plan does precisely the opposite.

Sincerely,
John Anderson
Isleton, Ca
95641

Typos courtesy iPhone

From: kenmckee54@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 9:12 PM
To: BDCP Comments
Subject: Re: Comments about the BDCP EIR/EIS

To Whom it May Concern,

Your EIR process has been a secretive, closed-door, unethical sham. No tunnels to divert Sacramento River freshwater to places where it does not belong.

Sincerely,
Kenneth McKee
A registered voter

From: kenmckee54@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 9:11 PM
To: BDCP Comments
Subject: Comments about the BDCP EIR/EIS

To Whom it May Concern,

Your EIR process has been a sham. No tunnels. Period. No tunnels to divert Sacramento River freshwater to places where it does not belong.

Sincerely,
Kenneth McKee
A registered voter

From: kenmckee54@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 9:08 PM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: No Tunnels

To Whom it May Concern,

No tunnels. Period. No tunnels to divert Sacramento River freshwater to places where it does not belong.

Sincerely,
Kenneth McKee
A registered voter

From: Jacquelyn Ross <jacquelynross@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2014 11:41 PM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Bay Delta Conservation Plan

Dear Staff,

I support the No Action Alternative. We need a plan that restores resiliency to the Delta. That's a long road but perhaps not longer than this huge BDCP document.

Thank you,

Jacquelyn Ross

From: Robert Arwine <robertarwine1@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 7:54 AM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: CM15

Sirs,

I have actively fished the Delta for the past fifty years.

The proposed changing of the regulations will have dramatic negative effects, if implemented.

I am employed at Sweeney's Sports located in Napa. Thirty percent of Sweeney's business is involved with Large Mouth Bass and Striper fishing. This nearly fifty year old, family owned business has nine employees. It is likely that if the Large Mouth and Stripers are eliminated, Sweeney's will also be eliminated.

Stripers, Large Mouth, Salmon and Steelhead have co-habituated in the Delta for over 130 years.

What is the science that has indicated that if these two fish are removed, the Salmon and Steelhead numbers will rebound?

Respectively,

Bob Arwine

From: innov8@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 8:05 AM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: BDCP.Comments against further water diversion and desalinization as a a long term and nearer term solution

Another canal diverting water from the Sacramento River is not solving our drought problem. If there is no rain, the reservoirs are not going to be filled. The main beneficiaries of this project are the contractors who build the project, the politicians who support it and Southern California.

Desalinization can solve our drought problems in the near time frame. Robbing Peter to pay Paul is not the solution. Desalinization plants will provide water long term and nearer term than the rain dependent reservoirs. It will also create jobs throughout the state. It will save our agricultural industry in the nearer term. We need water from desalinization plants throughout California as they have done in Australia, Israel, Saudi Arabia and even El Paso Texas.

John Brueck

5391 Cribari Crest

San Jose, CA 95135

From: tina holt <holtart4u@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2014 10:09 PM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Opposed to Flawed BDCP for Delta Tunnels

In researching information compiled pertaining to the Bay Delta Conservation Plan I see the Proposed Action (Tunnels) is in direct conflict with the California Water Code 85021; Violating the directive to stop reliance on the Delta for water needs. Also the violation of CWC 85021b will negatively impact the Delta as "Place" through the loss of species and habitat.

The reduction in River flows will allow salt water intrusion into the Delta. Recent reports from the California Water Foundation state the following:
The state's growing groundwater overdraft problems have resulted in a number of adverse consequences, including saltwater intrusion. Furthermore; Failure to provide meaningful ground water management will also increase energy costs due to pumping from greater depths, environmental degradation, and land subsidence that results in costly damage to infrastructure.

The BDCP 7.10.3, pgs. 7-21 Funding: Fails to adequately identify funding and wrongfully expects the taxpaying citizenry to accept an empty promise of fiduciary actions in an after-the-fact manner and not in the forthcoming and transparent path that is to be legally expected.

The BDCP chapter 7 Implementation Measures: The Authorized Entity Group (AEG) appears to fail to represent all vested interests as well as fails to adequately identify the stakeholders and their interests and ALL affiliations.

I have personally witnessed the profound abuse of water resources by Central Valley growers in their use of sprinkler systems during windy days experiencing sustained winds of 20-30 miles an hour. No significant water made it to the intended crops and just blew away.

The planting of inappropriate crop products in an arid location defies intelligence, to demand water be diverted from its natural flow in the Delta to support inappropriate farming is counter to best management practices.

I am opposed to this proposed project to divert water resources from Northern California to Central and Southern interests who repeatedly demonstrate willful abuse of water resources and wasteful practices.

Submitted by,
Tina Holt
11655 Clay Station Rd
Herald Ca
916-984-7182

From: Lauren Mills <lauren.m.mills@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 3:34 PM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: comments on BDCP

Hello,

I wish to comment on the issues with the BDCP.

I am not really sure how the "bay" is effected after reading several chapters and highlights of the document.

I grew up in Sacramento and have witnessed the decline of riparian landscape and aquatic life over my 28 years.

Currently water in the Sacramento and American rivers is at an all time low.

Simultaneously, farming and wetland around the Sacramento delta has made a stunning comeback through the efforts of truly sustainable farmers and pioneers in the area. UC Davis has contributed significantly to these efforts.

I do not support any falsely named "conservation" plans that would divert yet more water from the Sacramento Delta.

I don't believe this will help our salmon populations any. I believe the proposed diversions and construction of the twin tunnels will only cause more damage to already sensitive salmon populations.

My friend did some of the research for NOAA and CA Fish & Game that helped to close the commercial salmon fishing down for a season in 2008. As I'm sure you are aware, Chinook numbers were lower than they had been in California's history. Please consider this report from University of the Pacific:

Recently, there has been much discussion in California about the relationship between water and jobs. Water deliveries from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta have been reduced due to drought and environmental protections for fish including Salmon that are harmed by the powerful pumps which generate reverse flows on some rivers in the Delta. The decrease in water deliveries resulted in fallowed fields and reduced agricultural production in some areas of the San Joaquin Valley supplied by Delta water. California's salmon fishery was closed in 2008 and 2009 due to collapsing fish populations. The political battle over pumping restrictions has been characterized by some as fish versus farmers.

We estimate the salmon fishery closures resulted in the loss of 1,823 jobs and \$118.4 million in income compared to the level of the salmon fishery in 2004 and 2005.⁴

We don't need to supply Southern California with more water from the delta. What needs to happen, is smarter residential and industrial water practices down south, more efficiency, and more sustainable agricultural practices.

The water in the delta is a finite resource. This BDCP is essentially the same as not addressing our countries wasteful over reliance of oil, and before addressing efficiency and actual conservation, attempting to pump

more of it by drilling in Alaska. The restoration of vernal pools and seasonal wetlands is unlikely to aid the salmon populations, especially no more considering the stressors created by diversions.

Please put this project on hold. The water crisis is already bad enough, this will only compound issues and provide a temporary relief.

I propose no modifications and no increase to delta outflow for the time being. This is too grave a project to carry out without the majority of Californians being aware of the issue and having a say in it.

Thank you,

Lauren Mills
4100 Mera Street
Oakland, CA
94601

From: Lauren Mills <lauren.m.mills@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 9:22 PM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Re: comments on BDCP

I forgot to add, that we as a state cannot afford such a massive public works project. I would rather we put \$10 billions towards actual water efficiency measures and conservation in agriculture and urban settings. That would at least create jobs and actually benefit our sensitive water resources.

“Paying for the \$25 billion project -- which is certain to face years of lawsuits and probably a statewide ballot measure -- is also uncertain. State officials say water agencies will pay for about two-thirds of the cost through higher water rates. The rest they project to come from a state water bond on the November 2014 ballot and money from Congress, neither of which is guaranteed.”

Lauren Mills
4100 Mera Street
Oakland, CA 94601

On Tue, Jul 29, 2014 at 3:33 PM, Lauren Mills <lauren.m.mills@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello,

I wish to comment on the issues with the BDCP.

I am not really sure how the "bay" is effected after reading several chapters and highlights of the document.

I grew up in Sacramento and have witnessed the decline of riparian landscape and aquatic life over my 28 years.

Currently water in the Sacramento and American rivers is at an all time low.

Simultaneously, farming and wetland around the Sacramento delta has made a stunning comeback through the efforts of truly sustainable farmers and pioneers in the area.

UC Davis has contributed significantly to these efforts.

I do not support any falsely named "conservation" plans that would divert yet more water from the Sacramento Delta.

I don't believe this will help our salmon populations any. I believe the proposed diversions and construction of the twin tunnels will only cause more damage to already sensitive salmon populations.

My friend did some of the research for NOAA and CA Fish & Game that helped to close the commercial salmon fishing down for a season in 2008. As I'm sure you are aware, Chinook numbers were lower than they had been in California's history. Please consider this report from University of the Pacific:

Recently, there has been much discussion in California about the relationship between water and jobs. Water deliveries from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta have been reduced due

to drought and environmental protections for fish including Salmon that are harmed by the powerful pumps which generate reverse flows on some rivers in the Delta. The decrease in water deliveries resulted in fallowed fields and reduced agricultural production in some areas of the San Joaquin Valley supplied by Delta water. California's salmon fishery was closed in 2008 and 2009 due to collapsing fish populations. The political battle over pumping restrictions has been characterized by some as fish versus farmers.

We estimate the salmon fishery closures resulted in the loss of 1,823 jobs and \$118.4 million in income compared to the level of the salmon fishery in 2004 and 2005.⁴

We don't need to supply Southern California with more water from the delta. What needs to happen, is smarter residential and industrial water practices down south, more efficiency, and more sustainable agricultural practices.

The water in the delta is a finite resource. This BDCP is essentially the same as not addressing our countries wasteful over reliance of oil, and before addressing efficiency and actual conservation, attempting to pump more of it by drilling in Alaska. The restoration of vernal pools and seasonal wetlands is unlikely to aid the salmon populations, especially no more considering the stressors created by diversions.

Please put this project on hold. The water crisis is already bad enough, this will only compound issues and provide a temporary relief.

I propose no modifications and no increase to delta outflow for the time being. This is too grave a project to carry out without the majority of Californians being aware of the issue and having a say in it.

Thank you,

Lauren Mills
4100 Mera Street
Oakland, CA
94601

From: murtagh665@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 6:15 AM
To: BDCP Comments
Subject: Delta Tunnels

Please do not build the Delta Tunnels. It is not the solution for a sound, long term plan for the health of the Delta.

Thank you,
Tim and Maggie Murtagh

From: Patrick Pickerell <Pat@Peridotcorp.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 9:13 AM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: STOP THE TUNNELS AND THE DESTRUCTION OF THE DELTA

I emphatically object to the plan to build the two massive water diversion tunnels. You are about to strangle what is left of the delta permanently. The proposal to remove striped bass and largemouth bass from the system is ludicrous, the two species have coexisted with salmon and steelhead for 130 years.

Thanks,

Patrick Pickerell
President, Peridot Corporation
1072 Serpentine Lane
Pleasanton CA. 94566
925-461-8830 EXT11

From: Gene Hart <genehart23@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 9:29 PM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Save the Delta , this would be the biggest mistake that we could make. Stop trying to change Mother Nature !

Sent from my iPhone

From: Frank B. Jelinek <frank@classic-trophy.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 10:07 AM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Bay Delta Conservation Plan

Hello kind persons...

My name is Frank Jelinek and I enjoy the bay delta in various ways. I need to voice my concerns regarding the Bay Delta Conservation Plan.

I will not go into the bullet point outline of all the diverse and urgent concerns because this list is extensive and you will have read many, if not all, of my concrete concerns about the entire water diversion plan.

Instead, because this list is important and lengthy, in this letter I would like to iterate and urge you to take the time--as much as is needed--before acting on any of this entire proposal. There are too many crucial decisions that have the real potential to ruin the delta or, at the very least, create certain obstacles that are part of a domino effect when you are referring to delicate ecosystems.

I can only ask that every single one of the issues brought before this governing committee is thoroughly researched, explained and, equally important, understand how the various parts of the plan and delta will be affected by this linking of the different parts of the delta ecosystem coupled with the tunnel project and conservation project.

What would be extremely sad and detrimental, is if the greed (and don't kid yourself here, where there is massive money spent, there is greed and personal agendas), is allowed to gloss over ANY area of these concerns and components, there is the real potential for disaster, possibly in a way or ways we can't even foretell.

Please, Please, Please!....

Take the time to do this right to protect not only the physical landscape of the delta but, more importantly, the ecosystem of the delta. AND see clearly the ramifications and try to gain the insight as to the insight of the participants involved.

Thank you for your consideration and implementation of this idea of cautious and fastidious discovery of all facts and mechanisms involved in these projects.

Frank Jelinek
916-969-2450

"Be Kind for Everyone You Meet is Fighting a Hard Battle"--Plato

PLEASE NOTE OUR NEW PHYSICAL, BILLING AND REMITTANCE ADDRESS
HAS CHANGED!

2111 Q ST
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816

New Phone: 916-444-8339; New Fax: 916-444-6150

From: dlantz@SoftHome.net
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 9:03 AM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Voter/Taxpayer Comment

In my experience as CFO of several corporations, the most vital aspect in evaluating any project is the cost. Something might be "good", but the only way to compare it to any other approach is by comparing the costs along w/the benefits. I have waited anxiously to the last minute, to see whether the backers of the BDCP would come up w/a cost figure. They have not, while opponents have detailed many objections.

The only logical conclusion is that (a) nobody really knows the cost, or (b) it is a public funds give-away to those who sponsored it and stand to profit mightily from it. Or both. Until the public knows what they will pay, what the environmental and other costs are, and who will benefit how much, BDCP is a fraud.

From: Martin Heatlie <martin.heatlie@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 10:17 AM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Public Comment, Huge Delta Tunnels

I am a 72 year old life-time resident of California. I liked the Delta better the way it was when I was a boy. There were many more fish then, and I don't believe any species were endangered. Today many huge trees lining channels have been replaced with rocks. Also, because too much water is being diverted to the south, special dams have been constructed specifically to reduce the amount of salt water intrusion into the Delta. I understand many farmers are concerned that the salinity of the water they pump to irrigate their crops.is increasing. Crops don't grow in soil that is too salty.

Now add huge tunnels to further degrade the Delta. Salmon, sturgeon, smelt, and many other animal species are not designed to deal with huge tunnels. Please image yourself a few miles into one of the tunnels. It would be dark beyond compression. I cannot imagine a more hopeless situation.

When Teddy Roosevelt set aside the Grand Canyon as a National Park he stated: "Let this great wonder of nature remain as it now is. Do nothing to mar its grandeur, sublimity and loveliness. You cannot improve on it. But what you can do is to keep it for your children, your children's children, and all who come after you, as the one great sight which every American should see."

I believe this statement applies equally to the beautiful Delta. The proposed tunnels put the Delta at risk for the sake of water just as the Hetch Hetchy Dam altered the wonders of Little Yosemite Valley.

If the tunnels are built the project will provide high paying jobs for a few years and the workers will no doubt generously thank the tunnel supporters. But when the project is completed, the effects of the tunnels will be around long after the workers have moved on.

Because the Delta is a national, if not international, treasure, it would be wrong to construct the tunnels without addressing the variety of concerns that many people have expressed. If it is a good idea, and valid arguments can be made for why the tunnels should be built, is there a honest reason why the project should not be voted upon by the citizens of the counties in which the Delta exists. Ask San Franciscans if they like Hetch Hetchy dam and they probably would say they do, but ask the entire nation if it is right to build a dam in a nation park, and the answer would probably be no. The same issue and difference of opinion is true for the Delta.

Please add this letter to the public comments for the Delta Tunnels Project.

Sincerely,

Martin & Dawn Heatlie
PO Box 278
Wheatland, Ca. 95692
martin.heatlie@gmail.com

From: Paul Edgerton <paul.edgerton@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 10:22 AM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: BDCP is flawed

I attended one of the public information meetings and studied the DVD along with many editorial pieces about the proposed Bay Delta Conservation Plan.

To my mind, the most important factor in resolving California's water problem is greater storage. Our water supply is variable, so we need to store water during the wet years to carry us through the dry ones. This plan makes no provision to increase storage, only to speed the transit of water from northern to southern California. This would be accomplished at great cost, fiscally and environmentally, at a time when California can afford neither.

In short, we can't guarantee delivery of water downstream unless it exits upstream. Even if this plan could achieve all of its projected benefits while simultaneously avoiding all destructive consequences it would fail to address the underlying reality of a variable water supply.

The benefits are not worth the cost and the risks are large. I oppose this plan.

Paul Edgerton,
Stockton CA

From: Russ Smith <rangiwai2@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 11:45 AM
To: BDCP.Comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Please don't destroy the Delta

Any plan that recommends killing striped and black bass as part of a "recovery" is misguided. The problem is not the fish swimming around in the Delta it's the people taking all the water out of the Delta that are the problem. The tunnels are just the latest effort to destroy the Delta to get more water for farmers and Southern California and the BDCP seems to be content to just blame it on the fish so that once the fish are all gone, the fishermen will be too and nobody will complain about more water leaving the Delta.

Russ Smith
Sunnyvale, CA

From: Tim Eyster <viking99969@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 2:22 PM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: regarding the tunnels proposal

Dear Sirs,

We are strenuous in our objection to the background engineering work and the socio/economic work that exists for the Delta Water Diversion. Little to no work has been researched and communicated regarding the displacement of the HUMANS living in the delta and the impact that tunnel building will have. We do not consider a 10 yr project as having short-term impact on the lives of those Californians directly impacted.

Sincerely,

Tim & Alison Eyster
1649 Grey Owl Circle
Roseville, CA, 95661

From: Miranda Yanko <mirandayanko1234@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 29, 2014 2:32 PM
To: BDCP.comments@noaa.gov
Subject: Twin tunnels

Dear sir or madam,

I have serious concerns regarding the bay delta conservation plan. Taking fresh water out if the delta does not conserve the vital resource that is necessary for the ecology and economic stability of Stockton/sac area. We need the fresh water for farms that are here. The food/crops that are grown here are vital to our society and our world. This so called "conservation plan" doesn't give us any new fresh water it just takes it all away from us. This project is a big waste of money and time. We need to implement water conservation measures.

Please address these concerns at your earliest convenience, I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely, Miranda J. Yanko
Sent from my iPhone

