

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
LAND	1	<p>These comments on the California WaterFix Final Environmental Impact Report/Final Environmental Impact Statement (“FEIR/S”) are submitted on behalf of the Local Agencies of the North Delta (“LAND”). LAND is a coalition comprised of reclamation and water districts (“districts”) in the northern geographic area of the Delta. As local agencies in the areas most impacted by the significant and unavoidable environmental and other impacts of the California WaterFix (“the Project”), including the diversion of our primary water supply and conversion of our farmland to other uses, our member agencies have been active stakeholders in the BDCP planning process for over eight years. Four LAND member agencies were also cooperating agencies under the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C., § 4321 (“NEPA”)), and provided early consultation with the federal lead agencies regarding local impacts and mitigation. No activities pursuant to the cooperation MOUs has occurred for at least one year.</p> <p>Concerns with Truncated FEIR/S “Review” Period</p> <p>With this letter, LAND can only respond preliminarily to information and inadequacies in the FEIR/S. Given the inordinately short period between release of the FEIR/S just prior to Christmas and today, there has been insufficient time for the public to review new material in the FEIR/S, including extensive responses to comments (“RTCs”), and submit additional information related to compliance with CEQA and other laws. In addition to the sheer volume of material in the FEIR/S, the document design and organization precludes informed public review and comment. In particular, LAND objects to the failure of the lead agencies to clearly demarcate changes to text from the 2015 RDEIR/S in the FEIR/S. Similar to the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS (“DEIR/S”) and 2015 Partially Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS (“RDEIR/S”), the FEIR/S continues to obscure the agencies’ analysis and decisionmaking process. Moreover, there are virtually no specific internal cross references provided in the FEIR/S. A reference to an entire chapter or appendix—many of which are hundreds or even thousands of pages long—is insufficient and obfuscatory in violation of basic informational disclosure requirements.</p> <p>The legal flaws with the purported “close” of the ability of the public to submit information into the record for this project are described in the letter submitted by LAND and other organizations on January 19, 2017. By submitting these comments today, LAND does not concede that either of the lead agencies can limit LAND’s ability to submit additional comments on the voluminous FEIR/S prior to decisionmaking on the project.</p>	<p>This section expresses concerns by the commenter on the truncated review period for the Final EIR/EIS. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S. Please see Federal Register Notice Period for the California WaterFix Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) letter regarding requests for extending NEPA review period.</p>
LAND	2	<p>Concerns with Inadequate Responses to Comments</p> <p>Despite the rafts of paperwork involved in reviewing the Tunnels project, in virtually every case where a critical environmental or social issue is identified, the underlying analysis is insufficient to support the conclusions and inadequate to fully identify or weigh the impacts. This general deficiency has continued into the public comment process. LAND submitted comments on both the DEIR/S and the RDEIR/S for the project. In these comments, LAND expressed, among other things, that the analysis supporting the ecological premise, the conservation measures, and other aspects of the Preferred Alternative are fundamentally flawed. Due to these numerous deficiencies, a broad coalition of stakeholders including LAND agreed in their comments that the documents must be substantially revised and recirculated for review before a final determination on the Project could be made.</p> <p>As such, LAND was particularly disappointed to find that the lead agencies’ RTCs on the DEIR/S</p>	<p>This section expresses concerns by the commenter on the adequacy of responses to comments. The Final EIR/EIS and responses to comments were adequate and meet all requirements of NEPA and CEQA. Commenter references several comments as examples of failures to appropriately respond to the comment, which the lead agencies disagree with:</p> <p>In the comment referenced by LAND (RECIRC 402-1), the commenter was requesting information from the lead agencies and begins the comment by saying, “Here is the information regarding the documents I need for LAND’s review of the RDEIR/EIS...” The third item requested is the USACE white paper. The commenter claimed this white paper was referenced on page ES-2 of the RDEIR/SDEIS, but no such reference was found. Hence, the response to the comment stated that “no such reference appears in the RDEIR/SDEIS Executive Summary.”</p> <p>In RECIRC 2622-12, the response starts off by pointing out a fact that was in fact made in</p>

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		<p>and RDEIR/S showed the same symptoms that have ailed the prior products of this administrative process. Rather than thoughtfully considering and addressing the issues valuably brought to light by LAND and other public stakeholders, the lead agencies' RTCs are a litany of pre-formed language, conclusory statements, and vague documentary references with no specific citation. In several cases, it is not clear that the comment was read for content or that any attempt to was made to be responsive. In just one example, RTC to Comment Letter 402, Comment 1 states that the USACE White Paper was not properly listed as a reference. The response simply repeats the comment. The point of the Comment was that the USACE White Paper should be listed as a reference, which it eventually was in Errata Sheet dated September 23, 2015.</p> <p>Similar errors and oversights occur throughout the RTCs, in violation of CEQA Guidelines section 15088 and other requirements. Similarly, detailed specific comments were provided for the failure to assess operational impacts on water supply during droughts:</p> <p>The water supply analysis is misleading and fails to represent the recent actions by the project proponents to gain more water yield in drought periods at the State Water Resources Control Board ("SWRCB") [footnote], create dams in the Delta to divert water to the export pumps, reoperation of the Delta Cross-Channels, as well as the routine use of emergency exemptions to lower water quality standards. (RDEIR/S, Section 5.3.1.1 Quantitative Analysis of SWP and CVP Water Supply Impacts, p. 5-2, lines 23-42 and 5-3 lines 1-9.)</p> <p>(Comment Letter 2622, Comment 12.) The RTC is a generic cut and paste that avoids the comment entirely:</p> <p>The Final EIR/EIS includes model results for Alternatives 2D, 4A, and 5A as compared to the No Action Alternative and Existing Conditions in Appendix 5A, Section C, in addition to the model results previously provided in the Draft EIR/EIS. The comparative results between Alternatives 2D, 4A, and 5A and the No Action Alternative and the Existing Conditions are generally consistent with the impact analysis results presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS. Please see Master Response 30 regarding modeling.</p> <p>This anemic approach to RTCs violates CEQA Guidelines section 15088 and other requirements. In another case, the project's continued mischaracterization of its potential to cause harmful algal blooms ("HABs") was identified, using current scientific citations, to demonstrate how the project failed to meet any scientific standard, let alone a Best Available Science standard. (Comment Letter 2622, Comment 20.) The RTC restated the single, old study (Kimmerer 2004), and mischaracterized the science again. (Comment Letter 2622, Comment 21.) Immediately thereafter:</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 14. Please also refer to response to comment #20 and #21 within this comment letter. The potential effects of the alternatives on nutrients and flow in the Delta have been fully assessed in the EIR/S in Chapter 8, Water Quality, and Chapter 9, [sic] respectively.</p> <p>The non-responsive cut and paste error notwithstanding, this response and the Master Response 14, do not provide a single new expert citation related to HABs, Microcystis, and Microcystins, or any new scientific support for their related conclusions, and simply contain assertions without substantiation. The sweeping conclusion that "climate warming, not water</p>	<p>response several times to this comment letter (that specific modeling was done by Alternative 2D, 4A and 5A, but that those results aligned with the analysis done in the RDEIR/SDEIS), but also goes on to give a unique response directed at the other points raised in the comment regarding any additional water that would be needed for Alternative 4A mitigation. In response to the quoted statement "water supply analysis is misleading and fails to represent...actions...to gain more water yield in drought periods...", this comment is addressed both through Master Response 30 and Master Response 47.</p> <p>In the comment referenced by LAND (RECIRC 2622-21), the commenter (as an aside) critiques a typo that was not caught. It would be disingenuous to believe that within responses to 6999 comment letters received on the RDEIR/SDEIS alone, that there would not be some typographical errors contained within the responses. The comment (and this comment) alleges that the analysis fails to fully appreciate the dangers of microcystis and how Alternative 4A's effects on flow may affect microcystis within the Delta. Section 8.1.3.18 of the Final EIR/EIS describe the human health impacts of microcystis. It also describes existing conditions within the study area. The response to RECIRC 2622-25 gives support to the statement that climate warming and not water operations will determine future water temperatures.</p> <p>The response to Comment 2622-43 does not restate, in response to what was determined to be an opinion and not a question about the analysis in the document, what is already in the Final EIR/EIS analysis in Chapter 12, Impact BIO-186—that implementation of AMM4, AMM10, and AMM11, and Environmental Commitment 11 would reduce the potential for the introduction and spread of invasive plants and avoid or minimize the potential effects on natural communities and special-status species; therefore, these effects would not be adverse. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p>

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		<p>operations, will determine future water temperatures in the Delta” (FEIR/S, Master Response 14, p. 1-136), is incorrect and unsupported. (See e.g., Transcript from HABS Case in Chief presentation, attached as Exhibit 1, pp. 52, 62-63, 104-106.)</p> <p>The theme of simply not responding to technical comments using any scientific substantiation is continued throughout the responses. Notably in Comment Letter 2622, Comment 26, 9 comments or conclusions are simply redirected to the Master Response 14, which has virtually no analysis related to these points. Similarly, the response to Comment Letter 2622, Comment 43, concludes with no supporting analysis that “the project would have “no effect on the extent of water hyacinth in the Delta.” Local water supplies for all types of beneficial uses are threatened by the reduced flows that lead to HABS and aquatic weeds. Yet the FEIR/S cavalierly dismisses these local impacts, and focuses on water quality improvements expected for export recipients.</p>	
LAND	3	<p>LAND again urges that current scientific analysis be applied to the environmental analysis. In addition to our prior comments, we commend review of the following scientific studies in support of the critically important understanding of the proposed actions and their influence on the formations of HABS and their toxins:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bonilla S, Aubriot L, Soares MC, Gonzalez-Piana M, Fabre A, Huszar VLM, et al. 2012. What drives the distribution of the bloom-forming cyanobacteria <i>Planktothrix agardhii</i> and <i>Cylindrospermopsis raciborskii</i>? <i>FEMS Microbiol. Ecol.</i> 79:594-607; • Catherine Q, Wood S, Echenique-Subiabr I, Heath M, Villeneuve A, Jean- Francois, H. 2013. A review of current knowledge on toxic benthic freshwater cyanobacteria—Ecology, toxin production and risk management. <i>Water Res.</i> 47:5464-5479; • Harke MJ, Steffen MM, Gobler CJ, Otten TG, Wilhelm SW, Wood SA, et al. 2016. A review of the global ecology, genomics, and biogeography of the toxic cyanobacterium, <i>Microcystis</i> spp. <i>Harmful Algae</i> 54:4-20; • Li X, Dreher TW, Li R. 2016. An overview of diversity, occurrence, genetics and toxin production of bloom-forming <i>Dolichospermum</i> (<i>Anabaena</i>) species. <i>Harmful Algae</i> 54:54-68; • Otten TG, Crosswell JR, Mackey S, Dreher TW. 2015. Application of molecular tools for microbial source tracking and public health risk assessment of a <i>Microcystis</i> bloom traversing 300km of the Klamath River. <i>Harmful Algae</i> 46:71- 81; • Paerl HW, Otten, TG. 2013. Harmful cyanobacterial blooms: causes, consequences, and controls. <i>Microb. Ecol.</i> 65(4):995-1010; and • Preece EP, Hardy FJ, Moore BC, Bryan M. 2017. A review of microcystin detections in estuarine and marine waters: Environmental implications and human health risk. <i>Harmful Algae</i> 61:31-45. <p>The failure of the lead agencies to seriously address HABS using current scientific literature renders the FEIR/S inadequate.</p>	<p>This section provides suggestions by the commenter for additional literature on harmful algae. Harmful algal blooms are discussed in Chapter 8, Water Quality; Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Resources; and Chapter 12, Terrestrial Biological Resources. Section 8.1, Environmental Setting/Affected Environment, discusses several studies that are relied upon in the Final EIR/EIS analysis. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that would result in a new significant environmental impact.</p>
LAND	4	Concerns Regarding Newly Disclosed Reductions in Groundwater Levels	<p>The comment describes updated language included in the Final EIR/EIS for Impact GW-2: <i>During Operations, Deplete Groundwater Supplies or Interfere with Groundwater Recharge,</i></p>

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		<p>With respect to groundwater, the FSEIR/S reveals for the first time that groundwater levels were modeled to drop by 5 feet. (FSEIR, p. pp. 7-87, 88 [describing a “5-foot episodic lowering” under the Sacramento River for Alternative 4]; see also pp. 7-117, 7-118, 7-119 [referring to the same “5-foot episodic lowering” under Alternative 4A].) Yet no explanation for the change in analysis from the RDEIR/S is provided. Even though the FSEIR/S concludes that construction and operational impacts on groundwater will be less than significant, no credible explanation is provided to support that conclusion. Inexplicably, the RTCs state that: “The proposed project would not significantly impact local water supplies because no Delta water rights would be affected under any of the EIR/EIS action alternatives and changes in Delta surface water elevations would be relatively minor.” (Comment Letter 1787, RTC 94.) This circular and conclusive language ignores the FEIR/S admission that modeling for the project apparently shows groundwater tables lowering by about 5 feet. As documented in the Case in Chief submitted by LAND and other protestants in the SWRCB water rights proceedings (See Exhibit 1 and discussion below), the project would injure groundwater uses both during and after construction.</p>	<p><i>Alter Local Groundwater Levels, or Reduce the Production Capacity of Preexisting Nearby Wells</i>, presented in Chapter 7, Groundwater. In response to comments received on the Draft EIR/EIS, the text in Chapter 7 was modified to provide more clarity related to both the CVHM-D model results for Alternative 1A and the extrapolated results for Alternatives 4 and 4A. This additional, clarifying information did not alter the significance conclusions from the Draft EIR/EIS, and thus did not reveal any new significant effects or any substantial increase in the severity of any previously-identified effects that would require recirculation under CEQA or a supplemental Final EIS under NEPA. The discussion below describes groundwater modeling and groundwater effects under Alternatives 1A, 1B and 1C and how these analyses relate to Alternatives 4 and 4A.</p> <p>The 2013 Draft EIR/EIS described the effects of Alternatives 1A, 1B, and 1C on groundwater conditions as compared to the Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative, as presented in Sections 7.3.3.2, 7.3.3.3, and 7.3.3.4. As described in Section 3.5 of the Draft EIR/EIS, the operations of the north Delta intakes on the Sacramento River are identical under Alternatives 1A, 1B, and 1C. The physical differences between these alternatives are related to the conveyance facilities in between the intakes and Clifton Court Forebay. The changes in groundwater conditions under Alternatives 1A, 1B, and 1C, as compared to the Existing Conditions (CEQA), are caused by climate change, sea level rise, changes in the Sacramento River surface water elevations due to operations of the north Delta intakes, seepage from the intermediate forebay (Alternative 1A, only), or groundwater loss into canals (Alternatives 1B and 1C). Additionally, the changes under Alternatives 1A, 1B, and 1C as compared to the No Action Alternative (NEPA) do not include changes due to climate change and sea level rise, and, therefore, only include changes due to operations of the north Delta intakes, seepage from the intermediate forebay (Alternative 1A, only), or groundwater loss into canals (Alternatives 1B and 1C).</p> <p>For Alternatives 1B and 1C, which include surface canals, the impact (GW 2) was significant and unavoidable under CEQA, even with mitigation, due groundwater discharge into canals. (DEIR/EIS, pp. 7-58 – 7-59, 7-64-7-65.) For Alternatives 1B and 1C, the impact (GW 2) was adverse under NEPA, even with mitigation, due groundwater discharge into canals. (DEIR/EIS, pp. 7-58, 7-64.)</p> <p>For Alternative 1A, which includes tunnels rather than surface canals, the impact (GW 2) was less than significant under CEQA, without mitigation, including the effect of seepage from the intermediate forebay influencing Sacramento River groundwater levels. (DEIR/EIS, pp. 7-48 – 7-49.) For Alternative 1A, the impact (GW 2) was not adverse under NEPA, without mitigation, including the effect of seepage from the intermediate forebay influencing Sacramento River groundwater levels. (DEIR/EIS, p. 7-48.)</p> <p>Figures for GW-2 presented in Chapter 7 of the Draft EIR/EIS present the maximum negative effect on groundwater elevations as projected by the 2013 CVHM-D model over the simulation period. As shown in Figures 7-14 (Alt 1B) and 7-19 (Alt 1C) in the Draft EIR/EIS, the maximum negative effect on groundwater would be related to groundwater discharge into canals under Alternatives 1B and 1C, respectively, as compared to the No Action Alternative in the late summer and fall months when groundwater elevations would be low with or without the Project.</p>

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
			<p>Figure 7-8 presented in Chapter 7 of the Draft EIR/EIS shows the maximum negative effect on groundwater conditions under Alternative 1A, as compared to the No Action Alternative, would be caused by seepage from the intermediate forebay. Seepage from the intermediate forebay would increase the groundwater elevation in the area and flow into the Sacramento River in the winter and early spring months when groundwater elevations would be high with or without the Project, resulting in higher surface flows in the Sacramento River and higher groundwater levels adjacent to the Sacramento River than under Alternatives 1B and 1C, which do not include seepage from the intermediate forebay.</p> <p>The 2013 CVHM-D model results during the summer months for Alternative 1A, as compared to the No Action Alternative, indicates that the groundwater elevations along the Sacramento River would decline up to 5 feet as compared to the No Action Alternative in the same manner as shown for Alternatives 1B and 1C (Figures 7-14 and 7-19) if the seepage from the intermediate forebay were not to occur. However, since the condition related to the Sacramento River was not considered to be the most negative effect under Alternative 1A, that condition was not included in Figure 7-8, presented in Chapter 7, of the Draft EIR/EIS. Based upon the monthly results of the 2013 CVHM-D model runs, the projected monthly groundwater elevations along the Sacramento River for Alternatives 1B and 1C would be within 0 to 3 feet of the projected monthly groundwater elevations for the No Action Alternative 99 percent of the time. For the remaining 1 percent of the time, the change in groundwater elevation would be 4 to 5 feet lower under Alternatives 1B and 1C, as compared to the No Action Alternative. These calculated changes in model results indicate that conditions under Alternative 1B and 1C would not be substantially different than the No Action Alternative. As stated above, Alternative 1A, with reduced seepage from the intermediate forebay, would have the same operations and effects on Sacramento River surface water and adjacent groundwater as Alternatives 1B and 1C, and would have conditions along the Sacramento River that would not be substantially different than the No Action Alternative, as stated above for Alternatives 1B and 1C. Due to the model uncertainties based upon the use of the monthly CALSIM II model output used as the input values to the monthly CVHM-D model, these results would be considered to be similar.</p> <p>As described in Section 7.3.3.9 of the Draft EIR/EIS, changes in groundwater elevations along the Sacramento River related to the operations of the north Delta intakes under Alternative 4 (represented by the comparison of results for Alternatives 4H1, 4H2, 4H3, and 4H4), as compared to the No Action Alternative, would be similar to the conditions described under Alternatives 1A, 1B, and 1C, as compared to the No Action Alternative. For Alternative 4, which includes tunnels rather than surface canals, the impact (GW-2) was less than significant, even without mitigation. (DEIR/EIS, pp. 7-81 – 7-82.) This would occur because the calculated changes in monthly groundwater elevations along the Sacramento River due the operations of the north Delta intakes are directly related to the changes in monthly flows in the Sacramento River downstream of the intakes as simulated by the CALSIM II model. Because the monthly flows for Alternatives 4H1, 4H2, 4H3, and 4H4 (see Appendix 5A, Section C, Tables C-21-17 through C-21-20) are generally similar to, or greater than, flows under Alternatives 1A, 1B, and 1C (see Appendix 5A, Section C, Table C-21-14), it is anticipated that the monthly CVHM-D groundwater elevations along the Sacramento River associated with operations of the north Delta intakes would also be similar to, or higher than, those that would occur under Alternative 4 as compared to Alternative 1A, 1B and 1C. Therefore, separate CVHM-D model runs were not completed for Alternatives 4H1, 4H2, 4H3, and 4H4; and the impact analyses were based upon</p>

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
			<p>the comparison of results from Alternatives 1A, 1B, and 1C, as compared to the No Action Alternative. The effects of the operations under Alternative 4A, as compared to the No Action Alternative (ELT) are similar to the effects of operations under Alternative 4, as compared to the No Action Alternative (LLT). Therefore, the effects on the Delta groundwater resources based on the comparison to each of the No Action Alternatives are similar.</p> <p>Following publication of the RDEIR/SDEIS, additional information was compiled by DWR and reviewed by the EIR/EIS groundwater analysis team. The updated information is related to the use of deep slurry cutoff walls at the intakes, tunnel shafts, and forebays during construction, as well as the use of seepage control methods near the forebays during operations for Alternatives 4 and 4A.</p> <p>The forebays would be constructed with slurry cutoff walls and seepage cutoff walls around the embankments. These walls would avoid or minimize the flow of water through the embankments in accordance with the DWR Division of Safety of Dams requirements. The impermeable or low-permeability slurry cutoff walls and seepage cutoff walls would extend to an impermeable soil layer. The impermeable layers could be discontinuous around the perimeter of the forebays. In those areas, the potential for groundwater flow at depths under the embankments could be minimized through the placement of grout along the bottom of the slurry cutoff walls and seepage cutoff walls.</p> <p>As a result of the updated project description, the potential adverse effects to construction groundwater conditions identified as Impact GW-1: <i>During Construction, Deplete Groundwater Supplies or Interfere with Groundwater Recharge, Alter Local Groundwater Levels, or Reduce the Production Capacity of Preexisting Nearby Wells</i>, in the DEIR/DEIS and the RDEIR/SDEIS have been reduced to a level of less than significant and not potentially adverse, for CEQA and NEPA respectively for Alternatives 4 and 4A. Additionally, this updated information revealed reductions in the effect of seepage from the intermediate forebay for Alternatives 4 and 4A. In absence of seepage from the intermediate forebay, groundwater levels under the Sacramento River related to operations of the north Delta intakes would reflect conditions similar to Alternatives 1B and 1C, and could possibly result in an up to five-foot episodic lowering of groundwater levels adjacent to the Sacramento River. This effect is not considered significant and is not substantially different than the No Action Alternative under Alternatives 4 and 4A. For a significant groundwater impact to result, an alternative would have to deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level that would reduce well yields to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted. (DEIR/EIS, p. 7-38; Final EIR/EIS, p. 7-41.) An episodic five foot lowering of groundwater levels in an area, adjacent to a major river, with existing high groundwater levels does not translate into such a severe level of impact. Adverse effects on existing wells and existing or planned land uses would not occur. Thus, no mitigation is required to address operational effects on groundwater. Even so, out of an abundance of caution and in the name of transparency and full disclosure, Mitigation Measure GW-1 has been updated to include ongoing monitoring of groundwater levels along the Sacramento River for up to five years during north Delta intake operations. The expectation is that such monitoring will confirm that operations will not result in significant or adverse effects on groundwater levels in the vicinity of the north Delta intakes. In the unlikely event that problems are identified, the mitigation measure provides for taking steps to reduce any impact to a less than significant level.</p>

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
			In summary, groundwater modeling was thoroughly presented in the environmental documents for changes in groundwater elevations in the Delta based upon the CVHM-D model results. Additional written analysis of the model results was produced for the State Water Resources Control Board water rights hearing. This additional analysis indicated that groundwater recharge will not be affected to the extent that it will disrupt the use of groundwater wells within the vicinity of the CA WaterFix intake structures, pipeline alignment, or more broadly within the groundwater basin underlying the southern portion of Sacramento County. This analysis is contained within the testimony and exhibits submitted as DWR-218 (Gwen Buchholz Groundwater Impact Analysis) and DWR-80 (Testimony of Gwen Buchholz). Additionally please see Master Response 46, in Volume 2, Final EIR/EIS which discusses why new modeling and information presented in the Final EIR/EIS does not require further recirculation.
LAND	5	<p>Concerns Regarding Increased Salinity and Agricultural Impacts</p> <p>With respect to agricultural impacts, no progress has been made to better define or mitigate impacts on the largest contiguous acreage of prime farmland in the state. RTCs regarding agricultural impacts myopically discuss the adequacy of the mitigation approach, which remains inadequate. (See, e.g., Comment Letter 1787, Comment 123- 124.) No careful analysis has occurred of impacts on agriculture from increases in salinity over long timespans (the life of the project) or other changes, and mitigation remains inadequate.</p>	This section expresses concerns by the commenter regarding salinity and agricultural impacts in the Final EIR/EIS. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.
LAND	6	<p>Relevance of Cases in Chief from SWRCB Proceedings</p> <p>Submitted herewith are three cases in chief of Protestants in the Hearing Proceedings Regarding Petition Filed by the Department of Water Resources and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Requesting Changes in Water Rights for the California WaterFix Project (“CWF Water Rights Proceedings”). These cases in chief primarily focus on injury to groundwater and irrigation water uses, injury from increased incidence of HABs, and injury from increased salinity levels that would occur as a result of construction and operation of the proposed Tunnels project. This material is being submitted because these “injuries” to water uses are also significant insufficiently mitigated impacts under CEQA. To determine whether a project causes a significant effect on the environment, a CEQA lead agency must consider scientific and factual data, and the Project’s direct physical changes as well as reasonably foreseeable indirect physical changes to the environment. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15064, subds. (b), (d).) Where the agency determines that the project causes significant impact(s), it may not approve that project unless it adopts measures which mitigate impacts to less than significant levels, or makes findings that it is infeasible to do so. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15091.) The FEIR/S fails to do this.</p> <p>The proposed Tunnels would cause significant environmental impacts that would injure water users in several ways. The FEIR/S admits that during Tunnel construction, the project would deplete groundwater supplies and/or interfere with groundwater recharge. (See, e.g., FEIR/S Comment Letter 2622, Comments 14-18, FEIR/S, Comment Letter 1787, Comments 94, 102-104, 110.)</p>	This section expresses concerns by the commenter that there were adverse/significant impacts that were not disclosed in the Final EIR/EIS. The Final EIR/EIS disclosed all adverse/significant impacts and the document is adequate and meets all requirements of NEPA and CEQA. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.
LAND	7	Impacts to water quality still have not been sufficiently analyzed or mitigated. For instance, the lead agencies falsely claim that salinity standard D-1641 is met even where a Temporary Urgency Change Petition is granted to loosen that standard. But loosening the standard does	This section expresses concerns by the commenter that the water quality impact analysis is insufficient. The lead agencies maintain that the Final EIR/EIS disclosed and sufficiently mitigated where necessary all adverse/significant impacts and that the document is adequate

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		<p>not solve the issue for water users relying on high quality water for use on crops and for drinking water. (See FEIR, pp. 17 [Reclamation District 501 Comment Letter on DEIR/S salinity issues], 18 [Islands, Inc. Comment Letter on DEIR/S salinity issues], 65, 68, 74, 79 [LAND Comment Letter 2622 on RDEIR/S salinity issues], 349, 354-55 [LAND Comment Letter 1787 on DEIR/S salinity issues], 25, 32 [LAND Comment Letter 2870 on RDEIR/S salinity issues].)</p> <p>Additional impacts are also likely to occur from the CWF’s significant and unavoidable effects on microcystis bloom formation and agriculture. (FEIR/S, pp. 73-77 [LAND Comment Letter 2622 on EIR/S algae issues], 326 [LAND Comment Letter 1787 on RDEIR/S HABs].)</p>	and meets all requirements of NEPA and CEQA. This section does not raise any new issues that weren’t addressed in the Final EIR/S.
LAND	8	Though the lead agencies claim that there will be no significant impacts or injuries will to in-Delta water users (see, e.g., FEIR/S, Master Response 32), the FEIR/S fails to either demonstrate that this is so or provide safeguards or mitigation to prevent these injuries and impacts. Notably, in neither the environmental review process nor the CWF Water Rights has there been any effort to even identify and inventory what water uses would be injured by construction and operation of the Tunnels. The vague and unenforceable mitigation measures included in the FEIR/S moreover provide no assurances that groundwater, water quality, and agricultural, domestic and municipal water supply impacts would be avoided.	This section expresses concerns by the commenter that mitigation measures for in-Delta water user impacts are insufficient. The lead agencies maintain that mitigation measures are sufficient and meet the requirements of NEPA and CEQA. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.
LAND	9	LAND disagrees with the analysis performed in Master Response 32 of the FEIS/R. This analysis now assumes that there will be less than significant impacts to groundwater, whereas the RDEIR/S found that there would be significant and unavoidable impacts. For example, the FEIR/S finds that impact GW-1, defined as “During construction, deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge, alter local groundwater levels, or reduce the production capacity of preexisting nearby wells” is a less than significant impact for Alternative 4A. (FEIR/S, ES-59.) In contrast, the RDEIR/S determined GW-1 to be a significant impact for Alternative 4A. (RDEIR/S, Executive Summary, ES-42.) The FEIR/S fails to explain its new determination. A commitment to construct slurry walls alone does not ensure GW-1 will be less than significant.	This section expresses concerns by the commenter on Master Response 32. The text in Master Response 32 and Impact GW-1 describe the reasoning for the determination. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.
LAND	10	<p>Recirculation of the FEIR/S Is Required</p> <p>The FEIR/S also contains new information requiring recirculation of the document. Where “significant new information” is added to an EIR prior to certification, a lead agency must recirculate the EIR. Such information “can include changes in the project or environmental setting as well as additional data or other information.” (CEQA Guidelines, § 15088.5, subd. (a).) Just one instance of the significant new information included in the FEIR/S is Chapter 7’s disclosure that “[m]odel simulations also indicate up to 5-foot episodic lowering of groundwater levels beneath the Sacramento due to lower flows in the river as a result of diversions at the north Delta intakes that result in a reduction of river flows and elevations.” (FEIR/S, pp. 7-117-119.) This information does not appear in the RDEIR/S.</p> <p>Lowering of groundwater levels may interfere with productivity nearby groundwater wells for both domestic and agricultural uses. As explained in the LAND Case in Chief, the soils of the Delta are highly variable and it is very difficult to predict how a change in groundwater level in one location may affect nearby wells. (See Exhibit 1, Physical Injury, LAND-35 Errata, pp. 2-3; LAND-37 [geologic map and depositional process figures].) Moreover, the FEIR/S provides no analysis of how implementing mitigation measure GW-2 will prevent potentially significant impacts to local groundwater wells, with resulting impacts to domestic and agricultural water supplies, due to lowered groundwater levels. The admission that groundwater levels will drop 5 feet as a result of the new diversions on the Sacramento River is significant new information</p>	<p>The comment describes updated language included in the Final EIR/EIS for Impact GW-2: During Operations, Deplete Groundwater Supplies or Interfere with Groundwater Recharge, Alter Local Groundwater Levels, or Reduce the Production Capacity of Preexisting Nearby Wells, presented in Chapter 7, Groundwater. In response to comments received on the Draft EIR/EIS, the text in Chapter 7 was modified to provide more clarity related to both the CVHM-D model results for Alternative 1A and the extrapolated results for Alternatives 4 and 4A. This additional, clarifying information did not alter the significance conclusions from the Draft EIR/EIS, and thus did not reveal any new significant effects or any substantial increase in the severity of any previously-identified effects that would require recirculation under CEQA or a supplemental Final EIS under NEPA. The discussion below describes groundwater modeling and groundwater effects under Alternatives 1A, 1B and 1C and how these analyses relate to Alternatives 4 and 4A.</p> <p>The 2013 Draft EIR/EIS described the effects of Alternatives 1A, 1B, and 1C on groundwater conditions as compared to the Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative, as presented in Sections 7.3.3.2, 7.3.3.3, and 7.3.3.4. As described in Section 3.5 of the Draft EIR/EIS, the operations of the north Delta intakes on the Sacramento River are identical under Alternatives 1A, 1B, and 1C. The physical differences between these alternatives are related to the conveyance facilities in between the intakes and Clifton Court Forebay.</p> <p>The changes in groundwater conditions under Alternatives 1A, 1B, and 1C, as compared to the Existing Conditions (CEQA), are caused by climate change, sea level rise, changes in the</p>

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		<p>requiring recirculation of the FEIR/S. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15088.5, subd. (a).)</p>	<p>Sacramento River surface water elevations due to operations of the north Delta intakes, seepage from the intermediate forebay (Alternative 1A, only), or groundwater loss into canals (Alternatives 1B and 1C). Additionally, the changes under Alternatives 1A, 1B, and 1C as compared to the No Action Alternative (NEPA) do not include changes due to climate change and sea level rise, and, therefore, only include changes due to operations of the north Delta intakes, seepage from the intermediate forebay (Alternative 1A, only), or groundwater loss into canals (Alternatives 1B and 1C).</p> <p>For Alternatives 1B and 1C, which include surface canals, the impact (GW 2) was significant and unavoidable under CEQA, even with mitigation, due groundwater discharge into canals. (DEIR/EIS, pp. 7-58 – 7-59, 7-64-7-65.) For Alternatives 1B and 1C, the impact (GW 2) was adverse under NEPA, even with mitigation, due groundwater discharge into canals. (DEIR/EIS, pp. 7-58, 7-64.)</p> <p>For Alternative 1A, which includes tunnels rather than surface canals, the impact (GW 2) was less than significant under CEQA, without mitigation, including the effect of seepage from the intermediate forebay influencing Sacramento River groundwater levels. (DEIR/EIS, pp. 7-48 – 7-49.) For Alternative 1A, the impact (GW 2) was not adverse under NEPA, without mitigation, including the effect of seepage from the intermediate forebay influencing Sacramento River groundwater levels. (DEIR/EIS, p. 7-48.)</p> <p>Figures for GW-2 presented in Chapter 7 of the Draft EIR/EIS present the maximum negative effect on groundwater elevations as projected by the 2013 CVHM-D model over the simulation period. As shown in Figures 7-14 (Alt 1B) and 7-19 (Alt 1C) in the Draft EIR/EIS, the maximum negative effect on groundwater would be related to groundwater discharge into canals under Alternatives 1B and 1C, respectively, as compared to the No Action Alternative in the late summer and fall months when groundwater elevations would be low with or without the Project.</p> <p>Figure 7-8 presented in Chapter 7 of the Draft EIR/EIS shows the maximum negative effect on groundwater conditions under Alternative 1A, as compared to the No Action Alternative, would be caused by seepage from the intermediate forebay. Seepage from the intermediate forebay would increase the groundwater elevation in the area and flow into the Sacramento River in the winter and early spring months when groundwater elevations would be high with or without the Project, resulting in higher surface flows in the Sacramento River and higher groundwater levels adjacent to the Sacramento River than under Alternatives 1B and 1C, which do not include seepage from the intermediate forebay.</p> <p>The 2013 CVHM– D model results during the summer months for Alternative 1A, as compared to the No Action Alternative, indicates that the groundwater elevations along the Sacramento River would decline up to 5 feet as compared to the No Action Alternative in the same manner as shown for Alternatives 1B and 1C (Figures 7-14 and 7-19) if the seepage from the intermediate forebay were not to occur. However, since the condition related to the Sacramento River was not considered to be the most negative effect under Alternative 1A, that condition was not included in Figure 7-8, presented in Chapter 7, of the Draft EIR/EIS. Based upon the monthly results of the 2013 CVHM-D model runs, the projected monthly groundwater elevations along the Sacramento River for Alternatives 1B and 1C would be within 0 to 3 feet of the projected monthly groundwater elevations for the No Action Alternative 99</p>

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
			<p>percent of the time. For the remaining 1 percent of the time, the change in groundwater elevation would be 4 to 5 feet lower under Alternatives 1B and 1C, as compared to the No Action Alternative. These calculated changes in model results indicate that conditions under Alternative 1B and 1C would not be substantially different than the No Action Alternative. As stated above, Alternative 1A, with reduced seepage from the intermediate forebay, would have the same operations and effects on Sacramento River surface water and adjacent groundwater as Alternatives 1B and 1C, and would have conditions along the Sacramento River that would not be substantially different than the No Action Alternative, as stated above for Alternatives 1B and 1C. Due to the model uncertainties based upon the use of the monthly CALSIM II model output used as the input values to the monthly CVHM-D model, these results would be considered to be similar.</p> <p>As described in Section 7.3.3.9 of the Draft EIR/EIS, changes in groundwater elevations along the Sacramento River related to the operations of the north Delta intakes under Alternative 4 (represented by the comparison of results for Alternatives 4H1, 4H2, 4H3, and 4H4), as compared to the No Action Alternative, would be similar to the conditions described under Alternatives 1A, 1B, and 1C, as compared to the No Action Alternative. For Alternative 4, which includes tunnels rather than surface canals, the impact (GW-2) was less than significant, even without mitigation. (DEIR/EIS, pp. 7-81 – 7-82.) This would occur because the calculated changes in monthly groundwater elevations along the Sacramento River due the operations of the north Delta intakes are directly related to the changes in monthly flows in the Sacramento River downstream of the intakes as simulated by the CALSIM II model. Because the monthly flows for Alternatives 4H1, 4H2, 4H3, and 4H4 (see Appendix 5A, Section C, Tables C-21-17 through C-21-20) are generally similar to, or greater than, flows under Alternatives 1A, 1B, and 1C (see Appendix 5A, Section C, Table C-21-14), it is anticipated that the monthly CVHM-D groundwater elevations along the Sacramento River associated with operations of the north Delta intakes would also be similar to, or higher than, those that would occur under Alternative 4 as compared to Alternative 1A, 1B and 1C. Therefore, separate CVHM-D model runs were not completed for Alternatives 4H1, 4H2, 4H3, and 4H4; and the impact analyses were based upon the comparison of results from Alternatives 1A, 1B, and 1C, as compared to the No Action Alternative. The effects of the operations under Alternative 4A, as compared to the No Action Alternative (ELT) are similar to the effects of operations under Alternative 4, as compared to the No Action Alternative (LLT). Therefore, the effects on the Delta groundwater resources based on the comparison to each of the No Action Alternatives are similar.</p> <p>Following publication of the RDEIR/SDEIS, additional information was compiled by DWR and reviewed by the EIR/EIS groundwater analysis team. The updated information is related to the use of deep slurry cutoff walls at the intakes, tunnel shafts, and forebays during construction, as well as the use of seepage control methods near the forebays during operations for Alternatives 4 and 4A.</p> <p>The forebays would be constructed with slurry cutoff walls and seepage cutoff walls around the embankments. These walls would avoid or minimize the flow of water through the embankments in accordance with the DWR Division of Safety of Dams requirements. The impermeable or low-permeability slurry cutoff walls and seepage cutoff walls would extend to an impermeable soil layer. The impermeable layers could be discontinuous around the perimeter of the forebays. In those areas, the potential for groundwater flow at depths under the embankments could be minimized through the placement of grout along the bottom of the slurry cutoff walls and seepage cutoff walls.</p>

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
			<p>As a result of the updated project description, the potential adverse effects to construction groundwater conditions identified as Impact GW-1: During Construction, Deplete Groundwater Supplies or Interfere with Groundwater Recharge, Alter Local Groundwater Levels, or Reduce the Production Capacity of Preexisting Nearby Wells, in the DEIR/DEIS and the RDEIR/SDEIS have been reduced to a level of less than significant and not potentially adverse, for CEQA and NEPA respectively for Alternatives 4 and 4A. Additionally, this updated information revealed reductions in the effect of seepage from the intermediate forebay for Alternatives 4 and 4A. In absence of seepage from the intermediate forebay, groundwater levels under the Sacramento River related to operations of the north Delta intakes would reflect conditions similar to Alternatives 1B and 1C, and could possibly result in an up to five-foot episodic lowering of groundwater levels adjacent to the Sacramento River. This effect is not considered significant and is not substantially different than the No Action Alternative under Alternatives 4 and 4A. For a significant groundwater impact to result, an alternative would have to deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level that would reduce well yields to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted. (DEIR/EIS, p. 7-38; Final EIR/EIS, p. 7-41.) An episodic five foot lowering of groundwater levels in an area, adjacent to a major river, with existing high groundwater levels does not translate into such a severe level of impact. Adverse effects on existing wells and existing or planned land uses would not occur. Thus, no mitigation is required to address operational effects on groundwater. Even so, out of an abundance of caution and in the name of transparency and full disclosure, Mitigation Measure GW-1 has been updated to include ongoing monitoring of groundwater levels along the Sacramento River for up to five years during north Delta intake operations. The expectation is that such monitoring will confirm that operations will not result in significant or adverse effects on groundwater levels in the vicinity of the north Delta intakes. In the unlikely event that problems are identified, the mitigation measure provides for taking steps to reduce any impact to a less than significant level.</p> <p>In summary, groundwater modeling was thoroughly presented in the environmental documents for changes in groundwater elevations in the Delta based upon the CVHM-D model results. Additional written analysis of the model results was produced for the State Water Resources Control Board water rights hearing. This additional analysis indicated that groundwater recharge will not be affected to the extent that it will disrupt the use of groundwater wells within the vicinity of the CA WaterFix intake structures, pipeline alignment, or more broadly within the groundwater basin underlying the southern portion of Sacramento County. This analysis is contained within the testimony and exhibits submitted as DWR-218 (Gwen Buchholz Groundwater Impact Analysis) and DWR-80 (Testimony of Gwen Buchholz). Additionally please see Master Response 46, in Volume 2, Final EIR/EIS which discusses why new modeling and information presented in the Final EIR/EIS does not require further recirculation.</p>
LAND	11	<p>Conclusion</p> <p>LAND and local communities can support water supply projects that include successful collaboration, functional restoration, while protecting local water supplies and flood control structures. Unfortunately, the Tunnels project accomplishes none of these goals. While some</p>	<p>This section summarizes comments from earlier in the comment letter. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p>

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		<p>elements of LAND's comments may have been integrated into the FEIR/S, there is still inadequate support for adoption of Alternative 4A (or other similar alternatives). We request that these issues be resolved prior to making a final determination on the Tunnels project, and that we have an opportunity to weigh in on any new approaches or documents under consideration by the lead agencies.</p> <p>At a minimum, additional time would be needed for the affected public to thoughtfully respond to the information provided in the FSEIR/S. Please feel free to contact me regarding proper resolution of the issues discussed in this letter.</p>	
LAND	ATT 1	Within comment letter - footnote	This attachment is a 2015 errata sheet for the BDCP/California Waterfix Partially Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS and does not raise any environmental issue related to the Final EIR/EIS. 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.
LAND	ATT 2	16.11.17 CWF Hrg Transcripts	This attachment is a transcript that relates to 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.
LAND	ATT 3	SJC 001 Statement of Qualifications Linda Turkatte	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-001 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.
LAND	ATT 4	SJC 002 errata -- Written Testimony of Linda Turkatte-REVISED	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-002 errata 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
LAND	ATT 5	SJC 003 Statement of Qualifications Erik Ringelberg	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-003 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.
LAND	ATT 6	SJC 004 Testimony of Erik Ringelberg	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-004 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.
LAND	ATT 7	SJC 016 California Water Quality Monitoring Council: California Cyanobacteria and Harmful Algal Bloom (CCHAB) Network Announcement (8/29/2016)	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-016 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.
LAND	ATT 8	SJC 017 State Water Resources Control Board: Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program 2 page info sheet (8/29/2016)	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-017 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.
LAND	ATT 9	SJC 018 four page info sheet on Blue-Green Algae Blooms (updated 9/18/2013)	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-018 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.
LAND	ATT 10	SJC 019 Email from Christine Joab, Central Valley Water Board to EH-Directors RE: Cyanobacteria bloom in the San Joaquin River, 6/6/2016	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-019 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.
LAND	ATT 11	SJC 020 Email from Jeff Carruesco[EH] San Joaquin County to Christinge Joab RE: Cyanobacteria in San Joaquin County, 6/6/2016 (In response to C Joab email noted in SJC 019)	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-020 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
LAND	ATT 12	SJC 021 Email from Christine Joab to Jeff Carruesco [EH] RE: Cyanobacteria in San Joaquin County 6/6/2016 (responding to J Carruesco email as noted in SJC 020)	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-021 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.
LAND	ATT 13	SJC 022 Email from Christine Joab to Lisa Medina [EH] RE: Cyanobacteria Caution Sign 6/7/2016	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-022 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.
LAND	ATT 14	SJC 023 Email from Christing Joab to Lisa Medina [EH] RE: Cyanobacteria Caution Sign 6/7/2016	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-023 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.
LAND	ATT 15	SJC 024 Email from Christine Joab to Lisa Medina [EH] RE: Environmental Health Department and Public Health Department News Release, June 2016, 6/8/2016	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-024 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.
LAND	ATT 16	SJC 025 Email from Christine Joab to Lisa Medina [EH] RE: Information on dog deaths 6/8/2016	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-025 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.
LAND	ATT 17	SJC 026 Email from Jeff Carruesco [EH] to Christine Joab RE: Update on cyanobacteria conditions in Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel 6/17/2016	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-026 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
LAND	ATT 18	SJC 027 Email from Christine Joab to Jeff Carruesco [EH] RE: CDC launches reporting system for harmful algal blooms and associated illnesses 6/22/2016	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-027 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.
LAND	ATT 19	SJC 028 Email from Christine Joab to Lisa Medina [EH] RE: Smith Canal and cyanobacteria monitoring	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-028 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.
LAND	ATT 20	SJC 029 Email from Lisa Medina [EH] to Christinge Joab RE: Update on cyanobacteria conditions in Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel 7/8/2016	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-029 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.
LAND	ATT 21	SJC 030 Email from Christine Joab to Lisa Medina [EH] and Jeff Carruesco [EH] RE: Update on cyanobacteria conditions in Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel 7/28/2016	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-030 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.
LAND	ATT 22	SJC 031 Email from Lisa Medina to Christine Joab and Jeff Carruesco RE: Update on cyanobacteria conditions in Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel 7/28/2016 (This attachment is Exhibit SJC-031 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.
LAND	ATT 23	SJC 032 Email from Christine Joab to Hal MacLean, etc., RE: Current cyanobacteria bloom density conditions in the San Joaquin River (Stockton DWSC) 8/3/2016	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-032 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
LAND	ATT 24	SJC 033 Email from Michelle Wood to armorales@ucdavis.edu RE: Stockton CA microcystis algae blooms 8/4/2016	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-033 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.
LAND	ATT 25	SJC 034 Email from lyris@swrcb18.waterboards.ca.gov to Linda Turkatte [EH] RE: upcoming webinars and new videos 8/11/2016	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-034 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.
LAND	ATT 26	SJC 035 Email from lyris@swrcb18.waterboards.ca.gov to Lisa Medina [EH] RE: Monitoring Council releases harmful algal blooms portal 8/16/2016	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-035 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.
LAND	ATT 27	SJC 036 Email from Christine Joab to Jeff Carruesco RE: update on cyanobacteria conditions in Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel 8/17/2016	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-036 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.
LAND	ATT 28	SJC 037 Email from Christine Joab to Hal MacLean, etc., RE: Current cyanobacteria bloom density conditions in the San Joaquin River (Stockton DWSC) 8/22/2016	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-037 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
LAND	ATT 29	SJC 038 Email from California Health Alert Network to Keith Early RE: CAHAN Health Notification-Caution Related to Seasonal Blue-Green Algae Blooms 8/24/2016	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-038 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.
LAND	ATT 30	SJC 039 Email from Christine Joab to Jeff Carruesco, et.al., RE: Microcystin Concentrations at Big Break Regional Shoreline, 8/29/2016	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-039 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.
LAND	ATT 31	SJC 045 Kurobe et al. Springer Plus 2013, 2:491. Identification of harmful cyanobacteria in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and Clear Lake, California by DNA barcoding	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-045 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.
LAND	ATT 32	SJC 046 Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Regional Ecosystem Restoration Implementation Plan Ecosystem Conceptual Model. Delta Foodweb Conceptual Model Final Version Revised in Response to Reviewer Comments. Prepared by: John Durand, University of California, Davis	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-046 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.
LAND	ATT 33	SJC 047 Integration & Application Network ecocheck (webpage) [indicator of HAB on Potomac River 2015	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-047 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
LAND	ATT 34	SJC 048 Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology 460 (2014) 8-18 Major-but rare-spring blooms in 2014 in San Francisco Bay Delta, California, a result of the long-tem drought, increased residence time, and altered nutrient loads and forms, P Glibert, R. Dugdale, et al.	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-048 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.
LAND	ATT 35	SJC 049 Memorandum from Marin Greenword, ICF to Independent Review Panel, 2016 California WaterFix Science Peer Review, RE: Request for graphical representation of effects on Sacramento flow of the rules for water diversion and the amount of water that will be diverted from North Delta (Specific panel request #1)	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-049 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.
LAND	ATT 36	SJC 050 Errata to Water Agencies' response to discharger's petition for review	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-050 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.
LAND	ATT 37	SJC 051 scientific publication: The evolutionary diversification of cyanobacteria: Molecular-phylogenetic and paleontological perspectives. A Tomitani, A. Knoll, et al. 2/6/2006	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-051 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.
LAND	ATT 38	SJC 052 Draft technical report xxx March 2015: Factors affecting growth of cyanobacteria with special emphasis on the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-052 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
LAND	ATT 39	SJC 053 general descriptions of Freshwater Ecosystems	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-053 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.
LAND	ATT 40	SJC 054 Technical report: San Joaquin River Up-Stream DO TMDL Project ERP-02D-P63. Deliverable Title: An analysis of grazing and phytoplankton communities in the lower San Joaquin River above the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel, 5/19/2008	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-054 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.
LAND	ATT 41	SJC 055 American Society of Limnology and Oceanography publication: Nutritional quality of food resources for zooplankton (Daphnia) I a tidal freshwater system (Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta) A. Muller-Solger, A. Jassby, et al. 2002	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-055 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
LAND	ATT 42	SJC 056 publication: Artificial mixing to control cyanobacterial blooms: a review. P Visser, B. Ibelings, et al. 2/10/2015	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-056 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 Resources Control Board hearing materials.
LAND	ATT 43	SJC 057 Phycological Research 2015; 63: 56-63. Growth, toxicity and oxidative stress of a cultured cyanobacterium (Dolichospermum sp.) under different CO2/pH and temperature conditions A Brutemark, J Engstrom-Ost et al.	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-057 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 Resources Control Board hearing materials.
LAND	ATT 44	SJC 058 2005 Pelagic Organism Decline Program Progress Report: Microcystis biomass and toxicity 2005	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-058 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 Resources Control Board hearing materials.
LAND	ATT 45	SJC 059 CA EPA, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment: Toxicological summary and suggested action levels to reduce potential adverse health effects of six cyanotoxins	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-059 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 Resources Control Board hearing materials.

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
LAND	ATT 46	SJC 060 US EPA Drinking Water Health Advisory for the Cyanobacterial microcystin toxins. EPA-820R15100 June 2015	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-060 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.
LAND	ATT 47	SJC 061 World Health Organization International Agency for Research on Cancer, IARC Monographs on the evaluation of carcinogenic risks to Humans Vol. 94, Ingested nitrate and nitrite, and cyanobacterial peptide toxins, 2010	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-061 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.
LAND	ATT 48	SJC 063 USGS Innovation in Monitoring: The U.S. Geological Survey Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta, CA, Flow-station network, January 2016	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-063 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.
LAND	ATT 49	SJC 064 Figure 3. Projected 2010-2099 changes in nine environmental indicators, expressed as median trends per decade, for the A2 scenario (red) and B1 scenario (blue)	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-064 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
LAND	ATT 50	SJC 065 Open Access publication: Effects of the distribution of a toxic mycrocystis bloom on small scale patchiness of zooplankton, E. Reichwaldt, H. son, et al. 2013	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-065 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.
LAND	ATT 51	SJC 066 Oceanography publication: Evaluation of relationship between light intensity (Lux) and growth of chaetoceros muelleri. S Pal, N Sing, et al. 2013	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-066 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.
LAND	ATT 52	SJC 067 technical report: Sustainable techniques for selected live feed culture, Z Kassim, A John et al.	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-067 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.
LAND	ATT 53	SJC 068 Delta harmful Algal Blooms (HABs) CWF impacts, Erik Ringelberg	This attachment is Exhibit SJC-068 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
LAND	ATT 54	SJC Evidence: State Board Proceeding , Evidence submittal by Local Agencies of the North Delta et al., Islands, Inc,. And the San Joaquin County Protestants	This attachment is a list of exhibits and relates to 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.
LAND	ATT 55	SJC Opening Statement: State Board Proceeding, Opening statement of protestants county of San Joaquin, San Joaquin County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, and the Mokelumne River Water and Power Authority	This attachment is SJC's opening statements 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.
LAND	ATT 56	16.11.10 CWF Hrg Transcript November 10, 2016, Part 1b: Volume 28	This attachment is a transcript from 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.
LAND	ATT 57	LAND 1 DWR Drought Contingency Planning February 12, 2015	This attachment is Exhibit LAND-1 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
LAND	ATT 58	LAND 2 North Tunnel Plan and Profile Intake No. 2 to intermediate Forebay	This attachment is Exhibit LAND-2 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.
LAND	ATT 59	LAND 3 Tunnel Infrastructure map	This attachment is Exhibit LAND-3 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.
LAND	ATT 60	LAND 4 Local Agencies of the North Delta Coalition Member Districts	This attachment is Exhibit LAND-4 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.
LAND	ATT 61	LAND 5 Bogal water rights injuries from CWF tunnels	This attachment is Exhibit LAND-5 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.
LAND	ATT 62	LAND 6 Lange Twins water rights injuries from CWF tunnels	This attachment is Exhibit LAND-6 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
LAND	ATT 63	LAND 7 Elliot/Stillwater Orchards water rights injuries from CWF tunnels	This attachment is Exhibit LAND-7 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.
LAND	ATT 64	LAND 8 Municipal Water Quality Investigations Annual meeting, July 30, 2017: Top seven insights from the 2014 Delta Drought Modeling	This attachment is Exhibit LAND-8 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.
LAND	ATT 65	LAND 9 Slide 1: Sacramento inflow to Delta at Freeport (NAA)	This attachment is Exhibit LAND-9 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.
LAND	ATT 66	LAND 10 Graph: Change in EC at Old River at Bacon Island	This attachment is Exhibit LAND-10 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.
LAND	ATT 67	LAND 20 Testimony of Daniel Wilson	This attachment is Exhibit LAND-20 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.
LAND	ATT 68	LAND 25 Revised Testimony of Richard Elliot	This attachment is Exhibit LAND-25 revised 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.
LAND	ATT 69	LAND 30 Testimony of Russell Van Loven Sels	This attachment is Exhibit LAND-30 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
LAND	ATT 70	LAND 35 Errata Testimony of Josef Tootle, Revised	This attachment is Exhibit LAND-35 errata 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.
LAND	ATT 71	LAND 36 Qualifications of Josef J. Tootle	This attachment is Exhibit LAND-36 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.
LAND	ATT 72	Land 37 Tunnel alignment over old geologic base map	This attachment is Exhibit LAND-37 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.
LAND	ATT 73	LAND 38 Testimony of Robert Pyke	This attachment is Exhibit LAND-38 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.
LAND	ATT 74	LAND 39 Resume of Robert Pyke	This attachment is Exhibit LAND-39 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.
LAND	ATT 75	LAND 40 USGS Geological maps of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta	This attachment is Exhibit LAND-40 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.
LAND	ATT 76	LAND 41 ?Recent Peat Deposits-Louisiana Coastal Plain, D. Frazier and A. Osanik	This attachment is Exhibit LAND-41 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
LAND	ATT 77	LAND 57 Map showing private properties needed for Water Tunnel Intakes 2, 3 and 5	This attachment is Exhibit LAND-57 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.
LAND	ATT 78	LAND 58 Map of Estimated Location/depth ranges of wells near proposed intakes/tunnels (BSK Associates)	This attachment is Exhibit LAND-58 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.
LAND	ATT 79	LAND 59 maps of modified tunnel alignment with hand drawn location of permitted wells and potential public water system wells	This attachment is Exhibit LAND-59 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.
LAND	ATT 80	Land 60 Map of Intakes 2 and 3 project features	This attachment is Exhibit LAND-60 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.
LAND	ATT 81	LAND 65 DWR DHCCP Conceptual Engineering Report Vol.2, Final Draft July 1,2015	This attachment is Exhibit LAND-65 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.
LAND	ATT 82	LAND 66 DWR Notice for the 2002 Temporary Barriers Installation	This attachment is Exhibit LAND-66 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.
LAND	ATT 83	LAND 69 DCE CM1 Property Acquisition Management Plan	This attachment is Exhibit LAND-69 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
LAND	ATT 84	Land 72 email from James Mizell, DWR, to Osha Meserve RE: Request for modeling outputs, August 29, 2016	This attachment is Exhibit LAND-72 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.
LAND	ATT 85	Land Evidence submittal by Local Agencies of the North Delta et al., and the San Joaquin County Protestants	This attachment is a list of exhibits and testimony and relates to 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.
LAND	ATT 86	LAND Exhibit Index	This attachment is an Exhibit Index and relates to 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.
LAND	ATT 87	LAND Opening Statement: Opening statement of Osha Meserve	This attachment is LAND's opening statements 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.
LAND	ATT 88	16.11.04 CWF Hrg Transcript	This attachment is a transcript from 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.
LAND	ATT 89	II Exhibit Index Revised 11.28.16	This attachment is an Exhibit Index and relates to 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.
LAND	ATT 90	II_1: SOQ for Stan Grant	This attachment is Exhibit II-1 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
LAND	ATT 91	II_2_revised: Testimony of Stan Grant in support of Salinity Injury Focus Panel	This attachment is Exhibit II-2 revised 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.
LAND	ATT 92	II_3_revised: Delta Crops & Salt Water Intrusion with Twin Tunnel Operation by Stan Grant (Slides)	This attachment is Exhibit II-3 revised 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.
LAND	ATT 93	II_4: SWRCB-Div of Water Rights: WQ Response Plan Pursuant to Decision 1641--Dated July 28, 2004	This attachment is Exhibit II-4 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.
LAND	ATT 94	II_5: University of California, Division of Agricultural Sciences: Soil and Plant Tissue Testing in California: Bulleting 1879, Published 1978.	This attachment is Exhibit II-5 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.
LAND	ATT 95	II_7: Journal Article: 2014: Evaluation of Sensory Thresholds and Perception of Sodium Chloride in Grape Juice and Wine	This attachment is Exhibit II-7 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.
LAND	ATT 96	II_8: Reference Sheet: 2002: Irrigation Water Salinity and Crop Production: UC Davis: Stephen R. Grattan	This attachment is Exhibit II-8 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.
LAND	ATT 97	II_9: The Science of Grapevines: Anatomy and Physiology by Markus Keller: 2010	This attachment is Exhibit II-9 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
LAND	ATT 98	II_10: Journal Article: 2015: Long-term Response of Grapevines to Salinity: Osmotic Effects and Ion Toxicity	This attachment is Exhibit II-10 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.
LAND	ATT 99	II_12: Resume: Michelle Leinfelder-Miles	This attachment is Exhibit II-12 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.
LAND	ATT 100	II_13: Testimony of Michelle Leinfelder-Miles before the California SWRCB	This attachment is Exhibit II-13 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.
LAND	ATT 101	II_14: Slides: Presentation to the SWRCB by Michelle Leinfelder-Miles: The Effects of Water Quality on Soil Salinity and Leaching Fractions in the Delta	This attachment is Exhibit II-14 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.
LAND	ATT 102	II_15: FAO Irrigation and Drainage Paper Series: 1994: Water Quality for Agriculture, by R.S. Ayers and D.W. Westcot	This attachment is Exhibit II-15 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
LAND	ATT 103	II_16	This attachment is Exhibit II-16 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.
LAND	ATT 104	II_17	This attachment is Exhibit II-17 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.
LAND	ATT 105	II_18	This attachment is Exhibit II-18 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.
LAND	ATT 106	II_19	This attachment is Exhibit II-19 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.
LAND	ATT 107	II_20	This attachment is Exhibit II-20 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
LAND	ATT 108	II_21	This attachment is Exhibit II-21 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.
LAND	ATT 109	II_22	This attachment is Exhibit II-22 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.
LAND	ATT 110	II_23	This attachment is Exhibit II-23 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.
LAND	ATT 111	II_24_revised	This attachment is Exhibit II-24 revised 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.
LAND	ATT 112	II_25	This attachment is Exhibit II-25 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.
LAND	ATT 113	II_26	This attachment is Exhibit II-26 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.
LAND	ATT 114	II_27	This attachment is Exhibit II-27 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
LAND	ATT 115	II_29	This attachment is Exhibit II-29 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.
LAND	ATT 116	II_30	This attachment is Exhibit II-30 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.
LAND	ATT 117	II_32	This attachment is Exhibit II-32 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.
LAND	ATT 118	II_33	This attachment is Exhibit II-33 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.
LAND	ATT 119	II_37	This attachment is Exhibit II-37 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.
LAND	ATT 120	II_38	This attachment is Exhibit II-38 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.
LAND	ATT 121	II_39	This attachment is Exhibit II-39 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
LAND	ATT 122	II_40_Errata	This attachment is Exhibit II-40 errata 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.
LAND	ATT 123	II_41	This attachment is Exhibit II-41 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.
LAND	ATT 124	II_42	This attachment is Exhibit II-42 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.
LAND	ATT 125	II_43_Revised	This attachment is Exhibit II-43 revised 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.
LAND	ATT 126	II Opening Statement	This attachment is II's opening statements 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.