

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
San Juan Water District	1	<p>A. The Undisputed Evidence Confirms That the Project Has Potentially Significant Direct, Indirect and Cumulative Water supply Impacts in Dry Years on Folsom Reservoir Water Users</p> <p>As noted in the comment letters and materials submitted by the North State Water Alliance and the American River Water Agencies, the CALSIM II modeling performed by MBK Engineers shows that the dry year impacts to American River water supplies would be more severe and occur more frequently than the results obtained under the modified models that the lead agencies developed for this specific project (the "Proponents' Revised Modeling"). However, regardless of which modeling set is used, the results of the modeling show that, in dry years, the project could draw Folsom Reservoir down to levels where it causes potentially severe water supply impacts in dry years.</p> <p>Even the Proponents' Revised Modeling shows that, under future with-project conditions, Folsom Reservoir would be drawn down to its dead pool storage level, with only about 90,000 acre- feet of water in the lake, in dry years, resulting in water supply impacts to Folsom water users. Figure 4.3.1-10 of the RDEIR/SDEIS, which shows the results of Proponents 1 Revised Modeling for end of September storage for Folsom Reservoir under Existing Conditions (dashed orange line), the No Action Alternative (dashed black line), Alternative 4 H3 (solid green line) and Alternative 4 H4 (solid grey line), provides a good example of this data. The vertical graph on Figure 4.3.1-10 indicates the amount of thousands of acre-feet of water remaining in storage in Folsom Reservoir at the end of September. The Exceedance Probability at the bottom of the graph shows how frequently those conditions are expected to occur. When a point is graphed at 90% exceedance, that means there is a 90% chance that conditions will be wetter than shown at that point. In other words, a 90% exceedance point shows the conditions that the model anticipates would occur in the driest 10% of years.</p>	<p>Unlike the CEQA Existing Conditions baseline, the No Action Alternative (NAA) includes climate change and sea level rise assumptions, as do all of the action alternatives. For this reason, DWR, as CEQA lead agency, exercised its discretion, as allowed by CEQA case law (Neighbors for Smart Rail v. Exposition Metro Line Construction Authority (2013) 57 Cal.4th 439. 454), to account for future conditions under the NAA in assessing the significance of impacts under CEQA. (See also Master Response 1, Environmental Baselines.) The projected changes associated with sea level rise and climate change would result in "dead pool" conditions in SWP and CVP reservoirs upstream of the Delta even without the action alternatives, and thus would not be "effects" of the alternatives. The "dead pool" conditions presented in the CALSIM II model results in the EIR/EIS are developed from calculated monthly average reservoir volumes. Because the model only calculates and reports SWP and CVP water operations at an average monthly basis, the model cannot simulate changes that occur on a weekly basis by water users and SWP and CVP operations. In addition, the model cannot make decisions that occur in real-time, such as drought operations during the ongoing drought. Instead the model includes average operating criteria for all dry periods, and does not reflect specific changes. The dead pool conditions occur in the No Action Alternative as compared to the Existing Conditions because the model includes changes in precipitation without making changes in water diversion patterns. The EIR/EIS analysis considers changes between the frequency of dead pool conditions under the alternatives and the No Action Alternative (both with the same climate change assumptions) to determine if the changes are adverse or beneficial. See Master Response 47, Drought and EIR/EIS Modeling, Volume 2, Final EIR/EIS, regarding the sufficiency of the modeling approach used for evaluation of the alternatives in capturing the drought-related effects. Despite commenter's expert's difference of opinion on certain assumptions used in the modeling, the modeling and assumptions within the modeling relied upon by the lead agencies is considered appropriate to support the lead agencies' analysis of environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Project.</p> <p>This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.</p>
San Juan Water District	2	<p>As explained in the North State Water Alliance and American River Water Agencies comments, under both of the baselines that the Proponents have used to analyze the impacts of this project -the orange dashed Existing Conditions line or the black dashed No Action Alternative line - the project has potentially significant water supply impacts for Folsom Reservoir and the agencies that depend on it. See Section I.A.3. of the North State Water Alliance comments, discussing how the graph shows that: (1) in certain dry years, water supply will be reduced under the No Action Alternative as compared to Existing Conditions, and will be further reduced (doubled, in fact) under the proposed project as compared to the No Action Alternative, and (2) as compared to existing conditions, the proposed project's Alternative 4 H3 would more than double the frequency of Folsom Reservoir being drawn to dead pool in dry years.</p> <p>As shown by the flat green line representing the proposed project's Alternative 4 H3, if that alternative were implemented, Folsom Reservoir would be drawn down to dead pool levels in about the driest 7% of years, whereas this is only a risk in about the 3% of driest years under Existing Conditions (as shown on the graph by where the dashed orange line appears to go horizontally flat at less than 100,000 acre-feet of water in the reservoir).</p>	<p>Please see Comment #1. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.</p>

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		<p>This causes a significant dry year water supply impact for San Juan Water District, the City of Roseville, the City of Folsom, Sacramento Suburban Water District, and other water users that rely on water supplies delivered from Folsom Reservoir through the Folsom Lake Municipal and Industrial ("M&I") intake. As explained in the sworn testimony that the managers of San Juan Water District, the City of Roseville, and the City of Folsom gave in that hearing, the M&I intake is the only existing physical means by which these agencies can access their Folsom surface water supplies. Testimony of Shauna Lorange, P.E. (Exhibit SJWD-1,36); Testimony of Richard Plecker, P.E. (Exhibit Roseville-1,38); Testimony of Marcus Yasutake, P.E. (Exhibit Folsom-1, 21). (True and correct copies of all of the evidence submitted at the State Water Resources Control Board ("SWRCB") hearings on the proposed California WaterFix project that is cited in this letter have been attached to this letter as Exhibit A.) The center line of the M&I water intake is at elevation 317 feet above mean sea level (msl), at which point the reservoir holds approximately 65,000 acre-feet. (A true and correct copy of a diagram which was marked and submitted as Exhibit Folsom-18 in the SWRCB hearing shows the cross section of the dam at Folsom Reservoir along with the location of the M&I water supply intake and other water intakes; see Exh. A.)</p> <p>However, even before the M&I intake pipe is exposed, the agencies that depend on the M&I intake pipe would experience water supply problems because the M&I intake pipe becomes unsafe to use when there is not enough water in the reservoir above it. When the lake level is at 330 feet above msl, or about 89,000 acre-feet of water in storage, the existing pumping plant could incur damaging vortices because too little water is present above the M&I intake. When there is not enough water above the intake to take the place of the water that is being pumped out, pumping through the intake causes a vortex of air to form, which has a cyclone-like shape and depth. Because of the vortex, air could be carried into the pipe and ultimately reach the pumps themselves. Air in the pumps causes cavitation, which in turn causes destructive shock waves to the pump impellers. Because of these risks, the M&I raw water intake pipe at Folsom Lake becomes unusable when the reservoir level drops too low, even if the intake is still submerged. Exh. A, Testimony of Shauna Lorange, P.E. (Exhibit SJWD-1, 38); Testimony of Richard Plecker, P.E. (Exhibit Roseville-1, 40); Testimony of Marcus Yasutake, P.E. (Exhibit Folsom-1, 23). A true and correct copy of a report entitled "Increasing Water Supply Pumping Capacity at Folsom Dam, January 1996, ESA Consultants, Inc.," discusses the vortex phenomenon in more detail. See Exh. A, "Increasing Water Supply Pumping Capacity at Folsom Dam, January 1996, ESA Consultants, Inc." (Exhibit Folsom-19).</p> <p>In fact, as the testimony presented at the SWRCB hearings on California WaterFix has confirmed, it is undisputed that operating the Folsom Dam M&I Intake facilities at a lake level below 340 feet above msl creates unacceptable safety risks due to this potential for formation of a dangerous vortex. For this reason, in 2015, Drew Lessard, the Area Manager for USBR's Mid- Pacific Region's Central California Area Office, notified the Folsom water users that Reclamation would serve them through emergency facilities if the lake level dropped below elevation 340 feet above msl. Exh. A, Yasutake Testimony, 29; Plecker Testimony, 48 - 51; Lorange Testimony, 44 -47. At elevation 340 feet above msl, Folsom Lake has about 111,945 acre-feet of storage. Exh. A, Testimony of Shauna Lorange, P.E. (Exhibit SJWD-1, 45); Testimony of Richard Plecker, P.E. (Exhibit Roseville-1, 49); Testimony of Marcus Yasutake, P.E. (Exhibit Folsom-1, 37).</p>	

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		Figure 4.3.1-10 of the RDEIR/SDEIS shows that, under Alternative 4 H3, Folsom Lake would be reduced to about 90,000 acre-feet of storage at the end of September in approximately the driest 7% of years. Thus, the predicted Folsom Lake levels attained under Proponents' Revised Modeling include dry years where the lake is drawn down more than 21,000 acre-feet below the margin of safety established in 2015. Exh. A, Testimony of Shauna Lorange, P.E. (Exhibit SJWD-1, 51); Testimony of Richard Plecker, P.E. (Exhibit Roseville-1, 54); Testimony of Marcus Yasutake, P.E. (Exhibit Folsom-1, 37). In other words, as the results of the project have been represented by the solid green line on Figure 4.3.1-10, more than 5% of the time - or in more than one out of every 20 years - Folsom Reservoir would be drawn down to a level where Reclamation has deemed it would be unsafe to divert water through the M&I intake. Under the emergency measures that Reclamation proposed to implement in 2015, Reclamation would not even be physically able to deliver the full amount of settlement water supplies to either San Juan Water District or the City of Folsom, due to facilities capacity limitations. Exh. A, Testimony of Shauna Lorange, P.E. (Exhibit SJWD-1, 57); Testimony of Richard Plecker, P.E. (Exhibit Roseville-1, 60); Testimony of Marcus Yasutake, P.E. (Exhibit Folsom-1, 32). These results would not occur under Existing Conditions, as shown by the dashed orange line reflecting end-of-September Folsom storage levels ranging from 300,000 to 100,000 acre-feet for that same period where the green line (representing Alternative 4 H3) goes flat at about exceedance 93%. Obviously, then, the project poses a serious risk of injury to the dry year water supplies of the agencies that rely on the Folsom M&I intake for their water.	
San Juan Water District	3	The project would also have potentially significant indirect effects on the water supplies available to Sacramento Suburban Water District, which takes water under contracts with agencies that have rights to Folsom water supplies. The manager of that agency, Robert Roscoe, testified at the California WaterFix hearing before the SWRCB about his agency's sophisticated conjunctive use program, which involves not only water supplies diverted from Folsom Reservoir and the lower American River, but also cooperative groundwater management involving multiple nearby agencies. These agencies have come together to manage sustainably a formerly overdrafted groundwater basin and to monitor and manage known contamination plumes. As Mr. Roscoe testified, the project's reduction in deliveries of dry year water supplies from the American River could cause reasonably foreseeable impacts on groundwater in the Sacramento region as municipal and industrial agencies with fixed amount of minimum water demands were forced to turn to groundwater to make up the deficits in dry year supplies. Exh. A, Testimony of Robert Roscoe (Exhibit SSWD-1, 26-29).	As shown in the Final EIR/EIS Figure 5-45 and 5-46, Alternative 4A results similar storage conditions as the No Action Alternative. The frequency of years with Folsom storage at or below 100 TAF is the same between Alternative 4A and No Action Alternative, as shown in the Figure 5-46. The few such occurrences under both the No Action Alternative and the Alternative 4A is a result of meeting existing regulatory requirements and higher demands in the American River basin under projected climate change and sea level rise conditions, and not due to the elements of the proposed project. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
San Juan Water District	4	As noted in the North State Water Alliance comment letter, the Proponents claim that the lowered Folsom Reservoir levels would be "primarily" caused by climate change or increased local demands, rather than the dewatering that will occur under the project. However, as set forth in the North State Water Alliance comment letter, the EIR/EIS is fatally defective because the Proponents have failed to analyze the project's incremental contribution to these considerable cumulative impacts.	The effects of climate change and sea level rise on water supplies from Folsom Lake are considered under the No Action Alternative as well as the action alternatives. It is disclosed in the EIR/EIS that water supplies would be reduced under the No Action Alternative as compared to the Existing Conditions, not under the cumulative impact analyses. The EIR/EIS does not include mitigation measures related to changes under the No Action Alternative as compared to the Existing Conditions. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
San Juan Water District	5	An EIR must evaluate the reasonably foreseeable impacts of meeting water supply needs caused by the project. In re Bay-Delta Programmatic Environmental Impact Report, 43 Cal. 4th 1143, 1173 (2008); Habitat and Watershed Caretakers v. City of Santa Cruz, 213	Please see Comment #1. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		<p>Cal. App. 4th 1277, 1291 (2013). "The ultimate question under CEQA" is "whether [the EIR] adequately addresses the reasonably foreseeable impacts of supplying water to the project." Vineyard Area Citizens for Responsible Growth v. City of Rancho Cordova, 40 Cal. 4th 412, 434 (2007). Even for a large-scale EIR/EIS such as this one, the environmental analysis must, at a minimum, identify potential sources of water and analyze the environmental impacts associated with the water supplies that must be obtained in at least general terms. In re Bay-Delta Programmatic Environmental Impact Report, 43 Cal. 4th 1143, 1173 (2008); see also Vineyard, 40 Cal. 4th at 432 [CEQA analysis must address the impacts of likely future water sources, including the circumstances related to the water's availability]. Likewise, NEPA requires the lead federal agency to evaluate the project's direct and indirect effects, including all reasonably foreseeable effects of the project. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.8; Reclamation's NEPA Handbook, February 2012, p. 8-14 to 8-15, 8-17 to 8-18.</p> <p>Here, as explained in more detail in the North State Water Alliance and American River Water Agencies letters, the initial DEIR/EIS, the RDEIR/SDEIS, and the FEIR/EIS, collectively, do not contain adequate analysis of the project's potential impacts on dry year water supplies. None of these documents analyze any of the reasonably foreseeable direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts or evaluate the significance of the reduction in water supplies that the project will cause. Yet, as shown above, the potential real-world implications of this project, even according to the Proponents' Revised Modeling results as depicted in Figure 4.3.1-10 of the RDEIR/SDEIS, are that the number of dry years in which Folsom Reservoir will be drawn down to dead pool storage will more than double, and the agencies that depend on this source of supply may be rendered simply unable to obtain it. For this EIR/EIS to pass muster under either CEQA or NEPA, these potentially significant impacts of the proposed project must be evaluated.</p>	
San Juan Water District	6	<p>B. The Project's Potentially Significant Direct, Indirect and Cumulative Impacts on Dry Year Water Supplies in Folsom Reservoir Must Be Mitigated</p> <p>As noted in the North State Water Alliance letter, there are feasible mitigation measures that could be imposed to avoid or minimize the project's dry year water supply impacts. For example, in 2015, the SWRCB acted to impose a minimum lake level on Folsom Reservoir to ensure that there would be sufficient water in storage at the end of September to meet water users' demands if there were to be another dry year. The State Board noted:</p> <p>While fish populations are declining, Project storage levels are at critically and historically low levels. Shasta, Trinity, Oroville, Folsom and New Melones Reservoirs are at 29, 19, 26, 14, and 11 percent of capacity (at the beginning of December), respectively. Of particular concern in 2015 and going into 2016 is Folsom Reservoir, where storage levels have dropped to all-time low levels, which presents the possibility that diversion works for municipal water supplies for hundreds of thousands of people and other industrial needs could cease to function without the use of extraordinary methods such as the installation and operation of new pumping facilities.</p> <p>Water Right Order 2015-0043, corrected, at p. 4, a true and correct copy of which is attached to this letter as Exhibit C. As a result, the Order required Reclamation to develop and implement:</p>	Please see Comment #1. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		<p>A plan for operations of Folsom Reservoir that provides for the protection of municipal water supplies for hundreds of thousands of municipal users in the greater Sacramento area and fisheries dependent on Folsom Reservoir, including a minimum end of October 2016 storage level of at least 200 TAF [thousand acre-feet] to ensure adequate supplies for municipal uses going into the 2017 water year.</p> <p>Exh. C, Water Right Order 2015-0043, corrected, at p. 6; see also pp. 28, 39, 58, & p. 28 [noting State Water Resources Control Board's finding that establishing minimum levels for some reservoirs was deemed necessary to "conserve storage for use later in the year for critical needs" in the event that dry conditions persisted]. Thus, the lead agencies are well aware of at least one type of mitigation measure that is potentially feasible and that would avoid or minimize the project's potential impacts on dry year water supplies -but they have failed to even mention this in the EIR/EIS.</p>	
San Juan Water District	7	<p>Instead, the lead agencies have simply claimed that, in dry years, they would not operate Folsom Reservoir to dead pool levels. For example, at the SWRCB hearings on the California WaterFix project, both John Leahigh, the State Water Project operations lead, and Ron Milligan, the Central Valley Project operations lead, indicated that the projects would not actually be operated as depicted in the modeling that their respective agencies were presenting at the hearing. Exh. A, Testimony of Shauna Lorange, P.E. (Exhibit SJWD-1, 54); Testimony of Richard Plecker, P.E. (Exhibit Roseville-1, 57); Testimony of Marcus Yasutake, P.E. (Exhibit Folsom-1, 38).</p> <p>Recent history contradicts these claims -and, thus, shows the need for an enforceable mitigation measure to protect San Juan Water District, the City of Folsom, the City of Roseville, Sacramento Suburban Water District and other affected agencies from the project's potentially significant direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on their dry year water supplies. In March 2015, Reclamation submitted to the SWRCB a draft Temperature Management Plan for Shasta Reservoir that evaluated operational scenarios that resulted in draining of Folsom Reservoir. Exh. C, Water Right Order 2015-0043, corrected, at p. 17. In other words, Reclamation's draft Temperature Management Plan would have resulted in "indirect impacts . . . to Oroville and Folsom reservoirs from which more water was released to meet Delta outflow and salinity conditions. . . ." Exh. C., Water Right Order 2015-0043, corrected, at pp. 41 - 42. According to Reclamation's own modeling results, two of the operations scenarios that Reclamation submitted to the SWRCB would have drained Folsom Reservoir to dead pool storage; another scenario avoided these draconian results by making some rather optimistic projections about 2015 hydrology and potential water temperature ranges. Email from Ron Milligan, Reclamation, to Tom Howard, State Water Resources Control Board, Re: "March Temperature Runs - Item 6(b) of January 2015 TUC Order," March 26, 2015, p. 2, a true and correct copy of which is attached to this letter as Exhibit D. As the State Water Board staff noted, one of the scenarios Reclamation submitted "assumes that all reductions in water availability as a result of reduced Shasta releases are made up by export reduction and releases from Folsom Reservoir which drives the reservoir to dead pool in July." March 30, 2015 Request from State Water Board to Reclamation for Refined Sacramento River Temperature Modeling Information and a Plan for New Melones Operations to Reasonably Protect Fish and Wildlife, p. 3, a true and correct copy of which is attached to this letter as Exhibit E. In response, State Water Board staff requested evaluation of additional scenarios that did not drain Folsom Reservoir.</p>	<p>As indicated in the Final EIR/EIS, CVP and SWP will continue to operate to existing regulatory requirements. Any changes to regulatory requirements issued by the SWRCB, USACE, USFWS, or NMFS would require future environmental documentation prior to implementation, as described in the cumulative impact analysis of 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.</p> <p>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.</p>

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		<p>Exh. C, Water Right Order 2015-0043 , corrected, at p. 17. Although Reclamation modified its operations plans and the Temperature Management Plan for Shasta several times over the following months, the 2015 revised Shasta Temperature Management Plan submitted to the SWRCB in mid-June still proposed to allow Reclamation to draw Folsom Reservoir down to 120,000 acre-feet of stored water by the end of September. "Shasta Temperature Management Plan Key Points," June 18, 2015, p. 4, a true and correct copy of which is attached as Exhibit F.</p> <p>As set forth above, the undisputed evidence indicates that, at 120,000 acre-feet in storage, Folsom Reservoir would have only about 8,000 acre-feet of water supplies available before deliveries became unsafe. If Reclamation had discretion to operate this way, and if conditions in October, November, and December were dry, the water users dependent on Folsom Lake supplies could well be left without water.</p> <p>Thus, recent history confirms that, left to their own discretion, the lead agencies may indeed propose operations plans that deplete Folsom Reservoir, perhaps even to dead pool levels. The lead agencies have declined to identify an operations plan for the WaterFix project, so there are no defined criteria limiting their discretion in operations once this additional conveyance capacity comes online. Consequently, as set forth above and in the North State Water Alliance and American River Water Agencies letters, the California WaterFix project may be operated to draw down Folsom Reservoir and it therefore has the potential to cause significant direct, indirect and cumulative impacts on dry year water supplies for water users that depend on Folsom Reservoir. To comply with their obligations under CEQA and NEPA, the lead agencies must identify and adopt terms and conditions to mitigate or avoid these significant environmental impacts.</p> <p>The SWRCB has already identified and imposed one potentially feasible mitigation measure - maintain adequate carryover storage at Folsom Reservoir. A mitigation measure such as this would ensure that, even in the future with-project conditions, sufficient storage was maintained in Folsom Reservoir to protect against the project's potentially significant dry year water supply impacts. The lead agencies must evaluate potentially feasible mitigation measures such as this one, and must commit to adopting mitigation to reduce or avoid the California WaterFix's potentially significant dry year water supply impacts on Folsom Reservoir water users such as San Juan Water District, the City of Folsom, the City of Roseville, and Sacramento Suburban Water District.</p>	
San Juan Water District	ATT 1	Exhibit D Email From Ronald Milligan USBR Subject March Temperature Runs	This attachment describes March Sacramento River Temperature Model runs, associated operational forecasts for each scenario, and a general summary of results, as outlined in Section 6.b of the January TUC Order. This attachment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
San Juan Water District	ATT 2	Exhibit E March 30, 2015 Request from State Water Board to Reclamation for Refined Sacramento River Temperature Modeling Information and a Plan for New Melones Operations to Reasonably Protect Fish and Wildlife	This document describes additional information needed to further inform drought related actions by the State Water Board this water year. This attachment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
San Juan Water	ATT 3	Exhibit F Shasta Temperature Management Plan – Key Components	This document summarizes key components of that plan. This attachment does not raise

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
District			any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
San Juan Water District	ATT 4	EXHIBIT SJWD-1 TESTIMONY OF SHAUNA LORANCE, P.E.	This attachment is Exhibit SJWD-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.
San Juan Water District	ATT 5	EXHIBIT SJWD-2 STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS FOR SHAUNA LORANCE, P.E.	This attachment is Exhibit SJWD-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.
San Juan Water District	ATT 6	EXHIBIT ROSEVILLE-1e1 TESTIMONY OF RICHARD PLECKER, P.E.	This attachment is Exhibit Roseville-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.
San Juan Water District	ATT 7	EXHIBIT ROSEVILLE-2 STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS FOR RICHARD PLECKER, P.E.	This attachment is Exhibit Roseville-1e 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.
San Juan Water District	ATT 8	EXHIBIT SSWD-1 TESTIMONY OF ROBERT ROSCOE	This attachment is Exhibit SSWD-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.
San Juan Water District	ATT 9	EXHIBIT SSWD-2 STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS FOR ROBERT ROSCOE	This attachment is Exhibit SSWD-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.
San Juan Water District	ATT 10	EXHIBIT FOLSOM-1 TESTIMONY OF MARCUS YASUTAKE, P.E.	This attachment is Exhibit Folsom-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

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
			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.
San Juan Water District	ATT 11	EXHIBIT FOLSOM-2 STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS FOR MARCUS YASUTAKE, P.E.	This attachment is Exhibit Folsom-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.
San Juan Water District	ATT 12	FOLSOM RESERVOIR OPERATIONAL ELEVATIONS Graphic	This attachment is Exhibit Folsom-1 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.
San Juan Water District	ATT 13	Increasing Water Supply Pumping Capacity at Folsom Dam Report January 1996	This attachment is Exhibit Folsom-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.
San Juan Water District	ATT 14	Exhibit B RESPONSE OF CITY OF FOLSOM, CITY OF ROSEVILLE, SAN JUAN WATER DISTRICT AND SACRAMENTO SUBURBAN WATER DISTRICT TO EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS AND JOINDER TO SACRAMENTO VALLEY WATER USERS' RESPONSE TO EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS	This attachment is a response to evidentiary objections and joinder to Sacramento Valley Water Users' response to evidentiary objections 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.
San Juan Water District	ATT 15	Exhibit C STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD ORDER WR 2015-0043	This attachment is State Water Resources Control Board Order WR 2015-0043 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.
San Juan Water District	ATT 16	Exhibit D Email From Ronald Milligan USBR Subject March Temperature Runs	This attachment contains temperature model run scenarios 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.
San Juan Water	ATT 17	Exhibit E March 30, 2015 Request from State Water Board to Reclamation for Refined	This attachment is a request for refined Sacramento River temperature modeling

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
District		Sacramento River Temperature Modeling Information and a Plan for New Melones Operations to Reasonably Protect Fish and Wildlife	information and a plan for New Melones operations 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.
San Juan Water District	ATT 18	Exhibit F Shasta Temperature Management Plan – Key Components	This attachment contains key components of the Shasta Temperature Management Plan 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.
San Juan Water District	ATT 19	In re Bay-Delta Programmatic Environmental Impact Report , 43 Cal. 4th 1143, 1 173 (2008);	This attachment is a reference to the In re Bay-Delta Programmatic Environmental Impact Report and does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
San Juan Water District	ATT 20	Habitat and Watershed Caretakers v. City of Santa Cruz, 213 Cal. App. 4th 1277, 1291 (2013).	This attachment is a reference to Habitat and Watershed Caretakers v. City of Santa Cruz (2013) and does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
San Juan Water District	ATT 21	Vineyard Area Citizens for Responsible Growth v. City of Rancho Cordova, 40 Cal. 4th 412, 434 (2007)	This attachment is a reference to Vineyard Area Citizens for Responsible Growth v. City of Rancho Cordova (2007) and does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.