

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
California Water Research	1	<p>California Water Research hereby provides the attached comments on the civil engineering for the California WaterFix tunnels and the intake facilities, and the associated CEQA analyses in the Final EIR/EIS, including Chapter 9, Geology and Seismicity. The preliminary engineering analysis is incomplete, and does not provide enough information for the CEQA process. As a result, there is insufficient assessment of potential impacts of the project and insufficient consideration of necessary monitoring and mitigation.</p> <p>There are also major issues with the sea level rise assumptions being used for the project design. Section 9.2.26 of Chapter 9 also indicates that the following guidance for sea level rise is being used for the design of the WaterFix facilities:</p> <p>State of California Sea-Level Rise Task Force of the Coastal and Ocean Working Group of the California Climate Action Team (CO-CAT), Sea-Level Rise Interim Guidance Document, 2010. This document provides guidance for incorporating sea level rise projections into planning and decision making for projects in California. Using Year 2000 as a baseline, the sea level rise projections in California range between 10 and 17 inches by year 2050 and between 18 and 29 inches by year 2070.</p>	<p>This comment suggests that project engineering is not sufficient to support thorough environmental analysis and that modeling assumptions for sea-level rise underestimates the potential effect that could create issues for project operations and habitat restoration. This comment does not raise any new environmental issues that were not already addressed in the Final EIR/EIS responses to comments and the BDCP/California WaterFix Final EIR/EIS, Appendix 5A, Modeling and Technical Appendix, Section A.7 fully describes the methodology and assumptions used for the purposes of CALSIM II modeling used in the effects analyses.</p>
California Water Research	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Underestimating sea level rise in the project design will result in harmful realized impacts such as flooding. Harmful impacts are more likely to occur if the project design is based upon a low projection of sea level rise and less likely if higher estimates of sea level rise are used. In situations with high consequences (high impacts and/or low adaptive capacity), using a low sea level rise value involves a higher degree of risk. (Examples of harmful impacts that might result from underestimating sea level rise include damage to infrastructure, contamination of water supplies due to saltwater intrusion, and inundation of marsh restoration projects located too low relative to the tides). As of the date of the guidance document, the State Coastal Conservancy (SCC) and the State Lands Commission (SLC) have adopted, and the Delta Vision Blue Ribbon Task Force Independent Science Board has recommended, the use of 55 inches (140 cm) of sea level rise for 2100. The SCC and the SLC also adopted a policy of using 16 inches (41 cm) as the estimate of sea level rise for 2050. Agencies may select other values depending on their particular guiding policies and considerations related to risk, ability to incorporate phased adaptation into design and other factors. 	<p>This comment suggests that modeling assumptions for sea-level rise underestimates the potential effect that could create issues for project operations and habitat restoration. This comment does not raise any new environmental issues that were not already addressed in the Final EIR/EIS responses to comments and the BDCP/California WaterFix Final EIR/EIS, Appendix 5A, Modeling and Technical Appendix, Section A.7 fully describes the methodology and assumptions used for the purposes of CALSIM II modeling used in the effects analyses.</p>
California Water Research	3	<p>The following comments on sea level rise assumptions are drawn from testimony by California Water Research for the Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations / Institute for Fisheries Resources in Part 1B of the State Water Resources Control Board Hearing on the WaterFix Change Petition, which is attached. The supporting technical reference documents for the testimony are submitted into the administrative record in the Appendix to these comments.</p> <p>The Delta Independent Science Board recommended that the Bay Delta Conservation Plan use a median estimate of one meter (55 inches) of sea level rise for 2100, and use empirical estimates by the method of Rahmstorf. However, the ISB cautioned in their 2007 guidance that ice sheet melting could result in as much as 2 meters of sea level rise by 2100. The 2010 guidelines by the State Coastal Conservancy are for coastal locations and are not applicable to the Delta.</p> <p>As documented in the 2013 BDCP Draft EIR/ Draft EIS, the Department of Water Resources and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation knew by 2012 that the sea level rise estimates in the BDCP simulations were out of date, and that sea level rise could reach 1.67 meters by 2100:</p>	<p>This comment suggests that modeling assumptions for sea-level rise underestimates the potential effect that could create issues for project operations and habitat restoration. This comment does not raise any new environmental issues that were not already addressed in the Final EIR/EIS responses to comments and the BDCP/California WaterFix Final EIR/EIS, Appendix 5A, Modeling and Technical Appendix, Section A.7 fully describes the methodology and assumptions used for the purposes of CALSIM II modeling used in the effects analyses.</p>

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		The “[b]est available information suggests a range of potential SLR from 17 to 66 inches (42 to 167 centimeters) by 2100 (National Research Council 2012). (BDCP DEIR/DEIS, Chapter 29, p. 13:24-25).	
California Water Research	4	<p>The sea level rise assumptions used in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were also inconsistent with federal agency guidance. For the National Climate Assessment in 2012, the Climate Change Program Office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association (NOAA) derived a high estimate of 2 meters by 2100. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers estimated that sea level rise could reach 1.6 meters by 2100.</p> <p>However, the lead agencies decided not to update the 2007 sea level rise assumptions. According to the BDCP DEIR/DEIS,</p> <p>The projections from the NRC study were not used directly in the BDCP analysis for two reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the study was published in June 2012, well after the modeling analysis for BDCP had been designed and performed, and 2) the projection years are not directly aligned with the 2025 and 2060 analysis periods used for BDCP. 	This comment suggests that modeling assumptions for sea-level rise underestimates the potential effect that could create issues for project operations and habitat restoration. This comment does not raise any new environmental issues that were not already addressed in the Final EIR/EIS responses to comments and the BDCP/California WaterFix Final EIR/EIS, Appendix 5A, Modeling and Technical Appendix, Section A.7 fully describes the methodology and assumptions used for the purposes of CALSIM II modeling used in the effects analyses.
California Water Research	5	<p>In a 2014 review of the BDCP Draft Environmental Impact Report/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“DEIR/DEIS”), the Delta Independent Science Board (“ISB”) stated,</p> <p>The potential effects of climate change and sea-level rise are underestimated. . . . The potential direct effects of climate change and sea-level rise on the effectiveness of actions, including operations involving new water conveyance facilities, are not adequately considered. . . .</p> <p>In their response to our preliminary draft review, the Department of Water Resources noted that “the scope of an EIR/EIS is to consider the effects of the project on the environment, and not the environment on the project”. If the effects of major environmental disruptions such as climate change, sea-level rise, levee breaches, floods, and the like are not considered, however, one must assume that the actions will have the stated outcomes. We believe this is dangerously unrealistic. CEQA requires impacts to be assessed “in order to provide decision makers enough information to make a reasoned choice about the project and its alternatives”.</p> <p>(Exhibit PCFFA-8, Appendix, p. 6, footnotes omitted.)</p>	This comment is a discussion about a response to a comment on the Draft EIR/EIS suggesting that sea-level rise estimates/assumptions are not adequate. These comments are already addressed in the Final EIR/EIS in letter DEIRS 1448-58 and do not present substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.
California Water Research	6	<p>As explained in 2015 comments by California Water Research on the Revised Draft EIR/EIS, the best available science now shows that sea level rise is accelerating. In the 2015 comments, California Water Research cited new research supporting the 2012 NOAA high estimates of 2 meters by 2100:</p> <p>Estimates of sea level rise were an area of significant scientific uncertainty when DWR first did sensitivity studies for BDCP. At that time, there was significant uncertainty about potential contributions from melting of the polar ice sheets. But recent observations have shown that the rate of mass loss in the ice sheets in the west Antarctica and Greenland has been accelerating significantly. In December 2014, the American Geophysical Union accepted a paper by Tyler Sutterly and colleagues at UC Irvine and NASA JPL which found that the melt rate of glaciers in the Amundsen Sea Embayment in West Antarctica had tripled in the last decade. The analysis was comprehensive and authoritative, evaluating and reconciling data from 4 different measurement techniques over 21 years.</p>	Commenter previously made this comment in Volume 2, Final EIR/EIS, RECIRC 2606-4 where it was responded to in detail. Also refer to Master Response 19 in Volume 2, Final EIR/EIS, which provides an overview on how the lead agencies incorporated climate change and greenhouse gas (GHG) emission standards into the EIR/EIS analyses, including background information on both of these issues. Sea level rise is considered in two different portions of the analysis of action alternatives as compared to the No Action Alternative in the EIR/EIS. First, sea level rise is considered in the numerical modeling based upon results from the CALSIM II and DSM2 models. With respect to these model results, the analysis of operations of the action alternatives are compared using model runs that include identical sea level rise and climate change assumptions in the action alternatives and the No Action Alternative. The difference in model results between each action alternative and the No Action Alternative is due to the changes in operations of the alternative, and not due to sea level rise and/or climate change. If the sea level rise values were changed based upon different assumptions, those modified values would be included in both the action alternatives and the No Action Alternative; therefore, the incremental differences between the action alternatives as compared to the No Action Alternative would be similar to the results

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		<p>For the National Climate Assessment in 2012, the Climate Change Program Office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association (NOAA) used empirical estimates of the rate of acceleration of ice sheet melting to derive potential values of sea level rise as high as 2 meters (6.6 feet or 79 inches) by 2100. NOAA recommended that the highest levels be used where there is little tolerance for risk, such as in a new infrastructure process. Unfortunately, the highest estimate of sea level rise estimated by DWR's modelling for the Draft EIR/EIS was about 94 cm (3.1 feet or 37 inches) by 2100, about 50% of NOAA's 2012 empirical estimate. DWR's 95% confidence projection of 3.9 feet or 46 inches by 2100 was about 60% of NOAA's empirical estimate. These values were used to derive the estimate of 15 cm (0.5 ft or 6 inches) of sea level rise by 2025, and 45 cm (1.5 ft or 18 inches) by 2060 used in the RDEIR/SDEIS.</p>	<p>presented in the EIR/EIS. It should be recognized that any additional increase in sea level rise would cause increased salinity in SWP and CVP deliveries under both the No Action Alternative and action alternatives.</p> <p>As described in SWRCB CWF hearing part rebuttal testimony DWR-86, the sea level rise assumptions for the CVP-SWP operations modeling for CWF are within the range of projections and appropriate values selected based on the best available science. See Section 4, State Water Board Change Petition Process, Developments after Publication of the Proposed Final Environmental Impact Report, for discussion on State Water Recourses Control Board hearing materials.</p> <p>As noted in Section A.7.6 of BDCP Draft EIR/EIS (SWRCB-4) Appendix 5A, given considerable uncertainty in the sea level rise projections and the state of sea level rise science, BDCP used the mid-range estimates. For BDCP/CWF a 15 cm sea level rise was assumed by 2025-2030, and a 45 cm sea level rise was assumed by 2060 based on the Rahmstorf (2007), in considering the effects of sea level rise on the CVP-SWP operations with and without CWF. These assumptions were also consistent with Vermeer and Rahmstorf (2009), the USACE 2011 guidance for incorporating sea level change in civil works programs, and the National Research Council sea level rise projections from 2012 (SWRCB-4, Table 29-2).</p> <p>In addition to considering the 15 cm and 45 cm sea level rise projections, several other sea level rise values were simulated using UnTRIM, a three-dimensional Bay-Delta hydrodynamics and salinity model to capture the uncertainty in the sea level rise projections and to understand the potential impact on the Delta hydrodynamics and salinity intrusion. UnTRIM was simulated for sea level rise values including 15 cm, 30 cm, 45 cm, 60 cm, 140 cm and 140 cm with 5% tidal range amplification. UnTRIM results for the simulated sea level rise scenarios were included in the SWRCB-4, Appendix 5A Section D Attachment 3.</p> <p>It should be noted that there are differences in environmental conditions that would occur under the No Action Alternative as compared to the Existing Conditions; however, these changes are not mitigated under the Project because they would occur with or without the Project.</p> <p>Second, sea level rise is considered in the analysis of the design assumptions presented in the Conceptual Engineering Report (CER) for the proposed facilities. As described in the July 2015 CER, all facilities would be designed to be protected against a 200-year flood event with the sea level rise for Year 2100. The CER also describes that the flood levels, sea level rise, and wind-wave run-up values will be further refined during the design phase in the upcoming engineering phases, which will provide more accurate water surface elevation information. The determination of the sea level rise values will be in accordance with the requirements at the time of design as adopted by the State of California and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.</p> <p>This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. The Final EIR/EIS complies with both CEQA and NEPA.</p>
California Water Research	7	<p>The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers provides an online calculator for sea level rise. The closest sea level gauge is Port Chicago. The sea level rise calculator shows that, at Port Chicago, not only could sea levels reach 1.6-2 meters (5.2-6.6 feet) by 2100, they could reach 8.8-11.6 feet by 2135, within 100 years of the projected tunnel completion. (Exhibit PCFFA-64, Appendix.) In contrast, the Final Draft Conceptual Engineering Report is states that the WaterFix tunnel design will use an estimate of 18 inches of sea level rise. Given the disparity between the projections of sea level rise and the 18 inch estimate used in design of the facilities, the assumption that the WaterFix</p>	<p>This comment requests additional CEQA analysis that addresses whether the project could adapt to high levels of sea-level rise during the operational life of the project. The analyses in Chapter 29, Appendix 29D, Final EIR/EIS, address climate change uncertainty and how it may affect current SWP/CVP operations. Appendix 5A, Final EIR/EIS also provides all of the assumptions and research that was used to select the sea-level rise assumptions for Calsim II modeling. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. The Final EIR/EIS complies with both CEQA and NEPA.</p>

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		<p>project will have a 100 year lifetime is dubious. The CEQA process needs to evaluate whether the project, as designed, will be able to adapt to the high levels of sea level rise. Without this analysis of the potential impacts, there is not enough information for decision makers to make a reasoned choice about the project and its alternatives.</p> <p>In sum, there are major flaws and gaps in the preliminary engineering for the WaterFix project, which make the CEQA analysis incomplete and inadequate.</p>	
California Water Research	ATT 1	EMPIRICAL CALCULATIONS OF GROUND DISTURBANCE	See attachment 3 below. This attachment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that would result in a new significant environmental impact.
California Water Research	ATT 2	Corrected Testimony of Deirdre Des Jardins	This attachment is corrected testimony of Deirdre Des Jardins for the hearing proceedings regarding petition filed by the Department of Water Resources and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation requesting change in point of diversion for the California WaterFix. See Section 4, State Water Board Change Petition Process, Developments after Publication of the Proposed Final Environmental Impact Report, for discussion on State Water Recourses Control Board hearing materials.
California Water Research	ATT 3	COMMENTS ON CONCEPTUAL ENGINEERING AND CEQA FOR THE WATERFIX PROJECT	<p>The primary seismic standard, American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE), Standard 7-10, "Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures" cited by Mr. Tom Williams and Ms. Deirdre Des Jardins in their comments is not directly applicable to the proposed California WaterFix facilities such as tunnels and forebays. As stated in Section 1.1-Scope of the ASCE Standard 7-10, this standard provides minimum load requirements for the design of buildings and other structures that are subject to building code requirements. The proposed CWF tunnels and forebays are not subject to building code requirements.</p> <p>As disclosed in the Limitations and Acknowledgement section of the Final Draft Conceptual Engineering Report (CER) cited in the comments provided, all the information presented in the CER is at conceptual level and will need to be verified as part of additional investigations and detailed design. The CER was not intended to be a final design document and therefore cannot be used for construction as disclosed on the cover page of the CER. Also, it is noted on page 3-1 of Appendix 3C of the Final EIR/EIS that not all construction assumptions found in this EIR/EIS are intended to include a level of analysis sufficient to support all permit decisions. Rather, the EIR/EIS may later be supplemented through additional environmental documentation, if necessary under applicable CEQA and NEPA statutes and regulations. Refining conceptual level seismic design will not significantly change the footprint and other impacts described in the final EIR/EIS because the mitigations proposed for the facilities would mitigate for the worst case scenario for seismic hazards. The CWF tunnels are currently proposed to be located below liquefiable soils, intake structures would be supported on deep foundations with soil improvement, and foundation soils for the forebays and sedimentation would be improved.</p> <p>After the publication of final draft CER in July 2015, updates to the seismic design criteria were included in the final draft of Design and Construction Enterprise Agreement (DCE Agreement) that was published in January 2016 and cited as a reference by the commenters. The updated seismic design criteria are included in Section 3.0- Performance Standards and Design Considerations, Exhibit A of the DCE Agreement. The selection of seismic loading criteria for the facilities was based on the consequences of failure, the criticality of the structure for water delivery, and the downtime and cost for the repair of the facility. Generally, higher seismic loading criteria are recommended for structures that have larger consequences of failure, greater importance for water delivery, or longer downtimes or greater costs for repair. Conversely, lower seismic loading</p>

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
			<p>criteria are recommended for structures that are not critical to water delivery and/or can be repaired in a reasonable time frame. For example, canals can be repaired faster/cheaper when compared to tunnels or large pumps in a pumping plant.</p> <p>Appendix J of the final draft CER regarding evaluation of tunnel lining was updated in February 2017 is included as Exhibit DWR-659 to the California WaterFix SWRCB Change in Point of Diversion hearings. The updated study shows that for all the tunnels taken together (reaches 1 to 7), the sections subject to inflow will have a total inflow of -3.7cubic feet per second (cfs), and the sections subject to leakage will have a total leakage of 0.7 cfs; overall the entire system would have an inflow of 3cfs. These inflow and leakage rates are considered minimal and insignificant for approximately 74 miles of tunnels.</p> <p>The commenters have stated that final draft CER does not include any preliminary estimates of settlement during tunnel boring or any detailed discussion of procedures to evaluate and control settlement. Impact GEO-3, Section 9.3.4.2 of the final EIR/EIS provides a range for predicted settlement of 0.0 to 2.9 inches from tunneling. In addition, the response to Comment # 1054, DEIR Letter # 1601 in Volume II of the final EIR/EIS provides detailed discussion on methodologies that can used to estimate settlement during tunneling. DWR's commitments to perform geotechnical studies and monitor settlement are described in Environmental Commitments 3B.2.1.1- Geotechnical Investigations and 3B.2.1.2- Settlement Monitoring and Response Program, Appendix 3B of final EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The conceptual level of design, presented in the CER, is appropriate for conducting project-level environmental review under CEQA and NEPA. The EIR/EIS provides detailed information regarding the project features, components, characteristics, impacts, and mitigation of the proposed project. The type and format of information provided is consistent with the requirements of CEQA and NEPA to provide sufficient information regarding the proposed project and alternatives. Environmental review is typically conducted based on less complete plans, because complete final design is not required for impact assessment. The scope of the impacts analysis has been developed to be broad enough to cover all anticipated design elements, including tunneling and other proposed facilities.</p> <p>Once the final EIR/EIS has been certified, engineering work including additional geotechnical explorations, seismic and hydraulic analyses will progress toward final design and construction. As part of this next engineering phase, all the information presented in the CER will be reviewed and refined based on additional geotechnical data and results from other engineering analyses. As stated in Section 3B.2.2- Conform with Applicable Design Standards and Building Codes, Appendix 3B of final EIR/EIS, the project proponents will ensure that the standards, guidelines, and codes, which establish minimum design criteria and construction requirements for the proposed facilities, will be followed by the engineers, where applicable, in the design of project. The final design required for construction will be carried out under the responsible charge of licensed engineers, geologists, surveyors, and other professionals as required by California Law.</p> <p>This attachment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that would result in a new significant environmental impact.</p>

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
California Water Research	ATT 4	DRAFT REPORT OF THE INITIAL ANALYSIS & OPTIMIZATION OF THE PIPELINE/TUNNEL OPTION	This attachment is a DWR draft document and does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.
California Water Research	ATT 5	Exhibit PCFFA-78, Graphs, Deirdre Des Jardins, Climate Change Modeling for the BDCP / WaterFix, Figures 1-21. Available at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/california_waterfix/exhibits/docs/PCFFA&IGFR/PCFFA_78_DDjg.pdf	This attachment is climate change modeling presented Deirdre Des Jardins for the hearing proceedings regarding petition filed by the Department of Water Resources and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation requesting change in point of diversion for the California WaterFix. See Section 4, State Water Board Change Petition Process, Developments after Publication of the Proposed Final Environmental Impact Report, for discussion on State Water Recourses Control Board hearing materials.
California Water Research	ATT 6	Exhibit PCFFA-64, United States Army Corps of Engineers, table of regionally corrected sea level rise estimates for Port Chicago. August 16, 2016. Available at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/california_waterfix/exhibits/docs/PCFFA&IGFR/PCFFA_64_table.pdf	This attachment is Exhibit PCFFA-64, United States Army Corps of Engineers, table of regionally corrected sea level rise estimates for Port Chicago. August 16, 2016 and was presented for the hearing proceedings regarding petition filed by the Department of Water Resources and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation requesting change in point of diversion for the California WaterFix. See Section 4, State Water Board Change Petition Process, Developments after Publication of the Proposed Final Environmental Impact Report, for discussion on State Water Recourses Control Board hearing materials.
California Water Research	ATT 7	Exhibit PCFFA-65, United States Army Corps of Engineers, graph of regionally corrected sea level rise estimates for Port Chicago. August 16, 2016. Available at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/california_waterfix/exhibits/docs/PCFFA&IGFR/PCFFA_65_graph.pdf	This attachment is Exhibit PCFFA-65, United States Army Corps of Engineers, table of regionally corrected sea level rise estimates for Port Chicago. August 16, 2016 and was presented for the hearing proceedings regarding petition filed by the Department of Water Resources and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation requesting change in point of diversion for the California WaterFix. See Section 4, State Water Board Change Petition Process, Developments after Publication of the Proposed Final Environmental Impact Report, for discussion on State Water Recourses Control Board hearing materials.

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
California Water Research	ATT 8	Exhibit PCFFA-66, United States Army Corps of Engineers, Port Chicago sea level gauge data. August 16, 2016. Available at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/california_waterfix/exhibits/docs/PCFFA&IGFR/PCFFA_66_guage.pdf	This attachment is Exhibit PCFFA-66, United States Army Corps of Engineers, table of regionally corrected sea level rise estimates for Port Chicago. August 16, 2016 and was presented for the hearing proceedings regarding petition filed by the Department of Water Resources and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation requesting change in point of diversion for the California WaterFix. See Section 4, State Water Board Change Petition Process, Developments after Publication of the Proposed Final Environmental Impact Report, for discussion on State Water Recourses Control Board hearing materials.
California Water Research	ATT 9	Exhibit PCFFA-8, September 6, 2007 Letter from Mike Healey to John Kirilin Re: Projections of Sea Level Rise for the Delta P Projections of Sea Level Rise for the Delta. Available at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/california_waterfix/exhibits/docs/PCFFA&IGFR/PCFFA_08_Healey.pdf	This attachment is Exhibit PCFFA-8, September 6, 2007 Letter from Mike Healey to John Kirilin Re: Projections of Sea Level Rise for the Delta P Projections of Sea Level Rise for the Delta, and was presented for the hearing proceedings regarding petition filed by the Department of Water Resources and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation requesting change in point of diversion for the California WaterFix. See Section 4, State Water Board Change Petition Process, Developments after Publication of the Proposed Final Environmental Impact Report, for discussion on State Water Recourses Control Board hearing materials.
California Water Research	ATT 10	Exhibit PCFFA-9, May 15, 2014 Letter from Delta Independent Science Board to Randy Fiorini Re: Review of the Draft EIR/EIS for the Bay Delta Conservation Plan. Available at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/california_waterfix/exhibits/docs/PCFFA&IGFR/PCFFA_09_ISB.pdf	This attachment was received during a previous comment period and does not raise any substantive new environmental issues that were not previously addressed in Volume 2, response to comment letter 1448, of the Final EIR/S.
California Water Research	ATT 11	Exhibit PCFFA-10, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Technical Report: Global Sea Level Rise Scenarios for the United States National Climate Assessment. Available at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/california_waterfix/exhibits/docs/PCFFA&IGFR/PCFFA_10_NOAA.pdf	This attachment is Exhibit PCFFA-63, Sutterley, T. C., I. Velicogna, E. Rignot, J. Mougnot, T. Flament, M. R. van den Broeke, J. M. van Wessem, and C. H. Reijmer, Mass loss of the Amundsen Sea Embayment of West Antarctica from four independent techniques, and was presented for the hearing proceedings regarding petition filed by the Department of Water Resources and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation requesting change in point of diversion for the California WaterFix. See Section 4, State Water Board Change Petition Process, Developments after Publication of the Proposed Final Environmental Impact Report, for discussion on State Water Recourses Control Board hearing materials.

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
California Water Research	ATT 12	Exhibit PCFFA-63, Sutterley, T. C., I. Velicogna, E. Rignot, J. Mouginot, T. Flament, M. R. van den Broeke, J. M. van Wessem, and C. H. Reijmer, Mass loss of the Amundsen Sea Embayment of West Antarctica from four independent techniques, 41 Geophys. Res. Lett. 8421–8428. Available at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/california_waterfix/exhibits/docs/PCFFA&IGFR/PCFFA_63_Sutt.pdf	This attachment is Exhibit PCFFA-10, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Technical Report: Global Sea Level Rise Scenarios for the United States National Climate Assessment, and was presented for the hearing proceedings regarding petition filed by the Department of Water Resources and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation requesting change in point of diversion for the California WaterFix. See Section 4, State Water Board Change Petition Process, Developments after Publication of the Proposed Final Environmental Impact Report, for discussion on State Water Recourses Control Board hearing materials.
California Water Research	ATT 13	Exhibit PCFFA-67, J. Hansen, M. Sato, P. Hearty, R. Ruedy, M. Kelley, V. Masson-Delmotte, G. Russell, G. Tselioudis, J. Cao, E. Rignot, I. Velicogna, E. Kandiano, K. von Schuckmann, P. Kharecha, A. N. Legrande, M. Bauer, and K.-W. Lo, Ice melt, sea level rise and superstorms: evidence from paleoclimate data, climate modeling, and modern observations that 2 °C global warming is highly dangerous. Available at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/california_waterfix/exhibits/docs/PCFFA&IGFR/PCFFA_67_Hansen.pdf	This attachment is Exhibit PCFFA-67, J. Hansen, M. Sato, P. Hearty, R. Ruedy, M. Kelley, V. Masson-Delmotte, G. Russell, G. Tselioudis, J. Cao, E. Rignot, I. Velicogna, E. Kandiano, K. von Schuckmann, P. Kharecha, A. N. Legrande, M. Bauer, and K.-W. Lo, Ice melt, sea level rise and superstorms: evidence from paleoclimate data, climate modeling, and modern observations that 2 °C global warming is highly dangerous, and was presented for the hearing proceedings regarding petition filed by the Department of Water Resources and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation requesting change in point of diversion for the California WaterFix. See Section 4, State Water Board Change Petition Process, Developments after Publication of the Proposed Final Environmental Impact Report, for discussion on State Water Recourses Control Board hearing materials.

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
California Water Research	ATT 14	Exhibit PCFFA-68, Gregory Flato et. al., Climate Change 2013 The Physical Science Basis, Chapter 9: Evaluation of Climate Models. Available at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/california_waterfix/exhibits/docs/PCFFA&IGFR/PCFFA_69_Cayan.pdf	This attachment is Exhibit PCFFA-68, Gregory Flato et. al., Climate Change 2013 The Physical Science Basis, Chapter 9: Evaluation of Climate Models, and was presented for the hearing proceedings regarding petition filed by the Department of Water Resources and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation requesting change in point of diversion for the California WaterFix. See Section 4, State Water Board Change Petition Process, Developments after Publication of the Proposed Final Environmental Impact Report, for discussion on State Water Recourses Control Board hearing materials.
California Water Research	ATT 15	Exhibit PCFFA-69, Climate Change Scenarios And Sea Level Rise Estimates for the California 2009 Climate Change Scenarios Assessment, A Paper From the California Climate Change Center. Dan Cayan, Mary Tyree, Mike Dettinger, Hugo Hidalgo, Tapash Das, Ed Maurer, Peter Bromirski, Nicholas Graham, and Reinhard Flick. Available at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/california_waterfix/exhibits/docs/PCFFA&IGFR/PCFFA_69_Cayan.pdf	This attachment is Exhibit PCFFA-69, Climate Change Scenarios And Sea Level Rise Estimates for the California 2009 Climate Change Scenarios Assessment, A Paper From the California Climate Change Center. Dan Cayan, Mary Tyree, Mike Dettinger, Hugo Hidalgo, Tapash Das, Ed Maurer, Peter Bromirski, Nicholas Graham, and Reinhard Flick, and was presented for the hearing proceedings regarding petition filed by the Department of Water Resources and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation requesting change in point of diversion for the California WaterFix. See Section 4, State Water Board Change Petition Process, Developments after Publication of the Proposed Final Environmental Impact Report, for discussion on State Water Recourses Control Board hearing materials.
California Water Research	ATT 16	Exhibit PCFFA-72, Sarah Null and Josh Viers, Water and Energy Sector Vulnerability to Climate Warming in the Sierra Nevada: Water Year Classification in Non-Stationary Climates, July 31, 2012. Available at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/california_waterfix/exhibits/docs/PCFFA&IGFR/PCFFA_72_Null.pdf	This attachment is Exhibit PCFFA-72, Sarah Null and Josh Viers, Water and Energy Sector Vulnerability to Climate Warming in the Sierra Nevada: Water Year Classification in Non-Stationary Climates, July 31, 2012, and was presented for the hearing proceedings regarding petition filed by the Department of Water Resources and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation requesting change in point of diversion for the California WaterFix. See Section 4, State Water Board Change Petition Process, Developments after Publication of the Proposed Final Environmental Impact Report, for discussion on State Water Recourses Control Board hearing materials.

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
California Water Research	ATT 17	Exhibit PCFFA-74, David M. Meko, Matthew D. Therrell, Christopher H. Baisan, and Malcolm K Hughes, Sacramento River Flow Reconstructed To Ad. 869 From Tree Rings, Journal Of The American Water Resources Association, VOL. 37, NO.4, August 2001. Available at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/california_waterfix/exhibits/docs/PCFFA&IGFR/PCFFA_74_Meko01.pdf	This attachment is Exhibit PCFFA-74, David M. Meko, Matthew D. Therrell, Christopher H. Baisan, and Malcolm K Hughes, Sacramento River Flow Reconstructed To Ad. 869 From Tree Rings, Journal Of The American Water Resources Association, VOL. 37, NO.4, August 2001, and was presented for the hearing proceedings regarding petition filed by the Department of Water Resources and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation requesting change in point of diversion for the California WaterFix. See Section 4, State Water Board Change Petition Process, Developments after Publication of the Proposed Final Environmental Impact Report, for discussion on State Water Recourses Control Board hearing materials.
California Water Research	ATT 18	Exhibit IFR-1, David M. Meko, Central Valley Droughts Over Last 1,000 Years, 2009 California Extreme Precipitation Symposium (UC Davis, June 24, 2009). Available at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/california_waterfix/exhibits/docs/PCFFA&IGFR/IFR-1_Meko.pdf	This attachment is Exhibit IFR-1, David M. Meko, Central Valley Droughts Over Last 1,000 Years, 2009 California Extreme Precipitation Symposium (UC Davis, June 24, 2009), and was presented for the hearing proceedings regarding petition filed by the Department of Water Resources and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation requesting change in point of diversion for the California WaterFix. See Section 4, State Water Board Change Petition Process, Developments after Publication of the Proposed Final Environmental Impact Report, for discussion on State Water Recourses Control Board hearing materials.
California Water Research	ATT 19	Exhibit PCFFA-62, March 2013, Revised Administrative Draft, Bay Delta Conservation Plan, Appendix 2.C, Climate Change Implications and Assumptions. Available at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/california_waterfix/exhibits/docs/PCFFA&IGFR/PCFFA_62_BDCP2C.pdf	This attachment is Exhibit PCFFA-62, March 2013, Revised Administrative Draft, Bay Delta Conservation Plan, Appendix 2.C, Climate Change Implications and Assumptions, and was presented for the hearing proceedings regarding petition filed by the Department of Water Resources and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation requesting change in point of diversion for the California WaterFix. See Section 4, State Water Board Change Petition Process, Developments after Publication of the Proposed Final Environmental Impact Report, for discussion on State Water Recourses Control Board hearing materials.
California Water Research	ATT 20	Exhibit PCFFA-70, Department of Water Resources, Perspectives and Guidance for Climate Change Analysis. Available at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/california_waterfix/exhibits/docs/PCFFA&IGFR/PCFFA_70_DWRcc.pdf	This attachment is Exhibit PCFFA-70, Department of Water Resources, Perspectives and Guidance for Climate Change Analysis, and was presented for the hearing proceedings regarding petition filed by the Department of Water Resources and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation requesting change in point of diversion for the California WaterFix. See Section 4, State Water Board Change Petition Process, Developments after Publication of the Proposed Final Environmental Impact Report, for discussion on State Water Recourses Control Board hearing materials.

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
California Water Research	ATT 21	Exhibit PCFFA-71, Francis Chung et. al., Using Future Climate Projections to Support Water Resources Decision Making in California, California Climate Change Center, Final Report, May 2009. Available at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/california_waterfix/exhibits/docs/PCFFA&IGFR/PCFFA_71_Chung.pdf	This attachment is Exhibit PCFFA-71, Francis Chung et. al., Using Future Climate Projections to Support Water Resources Decision Making in California, California Climate Change Center, Final Report, May 2009, and was presented for the hearing proceedings regarding petition filed by the Department of Water Resources and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation requesting change in point of diversion for the California WaterFix. See Section 4, State Water Board Change Petition Process, Developments after Publication of the Proposed Final Environmental Impact Report, for discussion on State Water Recourses Control Board hearing materials.
California Water Research	ATT 22	Exhibit PCFFA-73, Abdul Khan and Andrew Schwarz Climate Change Characterization and Analysis in California Water Resources Planning Studies, Final Report, Department of Water Resources December 2010. Available at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/california_waterfix/exhibits/docs/PCFFA&IGFR/PCFFA_73_Khan.pdf	This attachment is Exhibit PCFFA-73, Abdul Khan and Andrew Schwarz Climate Change Characterization and Analysis in California Water Resources Planning Studies, Final Report, Department of Water Resources December 2010, and was presented for the hearing proceedings regarding petition filed by the Department of Water Resources and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation requesting change in point of diversion for the California WaterFix. See Section 4, State Water Board Change Petition Process, Developments after Publication of the Proposed Final Environmental Impact Report, for discussion on State Water Recourses Control Board hearing materials.
California Water Research	ATT 23	Exhibit PCFFA-20, Close et. al., 2003, A Strategic Review of CalSim II and its Use for Water Planning, Management, and Operations in Central California. Available at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/california_waterfix/exhibits/docs/PCFFA&IGFR/PCFFA_20_review.pdf	This attachment is Exhibit PCFFA-20, Close et. al., 2003, A Strategic Review of CalSim II and its Use for Water Planning, Management, and Operations in Central California, and was presented for the hearing proceedings regarding petition filed by the Department of Water Resources and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation requesting change in point of diversion for the California WaterFix. See Section 4, State Water Board Change Petition Process, Developments after Publication of the Proposed Final Environmental Impact Report, for discussion on State Water Recourses Control Board hearing materials.

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
California Water Research	ATT 24	Exhibit PCFFA-79, Review Panel Report San Joaquin River Valley CalSim II Model Review, 2006. Available at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/california_waterfix/exhibits/docs/PCFFA&IGFR/PCFFA_79_PR2006.pdf	This attachment is Exhibit PCFFA-79, Review Panel Report San Joaquin River Valley CalSim II Model Review, and was presented for the hearing proceedings regarding petition filed by the Department of Water Resources and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation requesting change in point of diversion for the California WaterFix. See Section 4, State Water Board Change Petition Process, Developments after Publication of the Proposed Final Environmental Impact Report, for discussion on State Water Recourses Control Board hearing materials.
California Water Research	ATT 25	Exhibit PCFFA-80, PEER REVIEW RESPONSE: A Report by DWR/Reclamation in Reply to the Peer Review of the CalSim-II Model Sponsored by the CALFED Science Program in December 2003. Available at http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/california_waterfix/exhibits/docs/PCFFA&IGFR/PCFFA_80_PR2004.pdf	This attachment is Exhibit PCFFA-80, PEER REVIEW RESPONSE: A Report by DWR/Reclamation in Reply to the Peer Review of the CalSim-II Model Sponsored by the CALFED Science Program in December 2003, and was presented for the hearing proceedings regarding petition filed by the Department of Water Resources and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation requesting change in point of diversion for the California WaterFix. See Section 4, State Water Board Change Petition Process, Developments after Publication of the Proposed Final Environmental Impact Report, for discussion on State Water Recourses Control Board hearing materials.