Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	1	I hereby join in the request for an extension of at least 90 days for review and comment to the final EIR-EIS regarding California WaterFix. The volume of comments and the lack of substantial change between the draft EIR-EIS and the Final version give an indication that comments from the public were only given a passing glance and our on-the-ground and in-the-water knowledge has been ignored in favor of computer models that have received substantial criticisms from professionals in the modeling industry. If an extension is not granted, then I hereby incorporate by reference the comments I submitted to DWR in the previous draft EIR-EIS process, and resubmit those comments, noting that DWR's responses to many of my concerns were commented upon by DWR but not resolved. In addition, through the WaterFix water rights hearing process of 2016, additional issues came up. Those issues include impacts to Delta drinking water wells and drinking water aquifer in the construction phase and also over the long term with operation of the proposed tunnels, impacts to recreation and transportation due to traffic hindrances and road damage from construction vehicles, and failure of DWR/USBR to define a procedure whereby impacted parties could resolve the issues or impacts without undue litigation, delay and cost to the impacted parties. Specifically incorporated into this letter are the following documents which remain at the linked pages throughout the waterfix and BDCP EIR-EIS process.	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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 1	Comments on the Draft BDCP; July 29, 2014 - BDCP 1656	This attachment was received during a previous comment period and does not raise any substantive new environmental issues that were not previously addressed in Volume 2, response to comment letter 1656 of the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 2	USACE comments on BDCP/WaterFix/EcoFix Public Notice SPK-2008-00861 - 404 permit comments These comments are submitted by an in-Delta land and business owner who has lived through the "on the ground" environmental combat zone that is the current California Delta Region. I do not need to guess probable impacts on the affected aquatic environment and the secondary or cumulative effects because I can describe the real life impacts already happening based on the flow changes and "restoration" test sites along Steamboat Slough and other North Delta waterways. Some of the proposed actions of the BDCP/WaterFix/EcoFix will create new hazards to navigation, could create greater risk of flooding in some areas of the North Delta, would accelerate further degradation of native aquatic species, and would put freshwater wells of residents and businesses in the Delta and San Francisco Bay area at risk of permanent destruction. What BDCP/DWR computer modeling says and what are real life experiences are two very different matters. I am also concerned that USACE Decision Makers may not be utilizing correct baseline data when making decisions, because so much of the data used by BDCP/WaterFix/EcoFix proponents is verifiably incorrect baseline data.	This comment letter was also submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) on the application submitted by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) to the Corps to construct the California WaterFix program pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act (November 9, 2015). It also contains several comments received during a previous comment period and does not raise any substantive new issues that weren't addressed in the Final EIR/S, Volume 2, response to comments, letter 1656 and 2639. This comment raises concern over impacts to navigation, aquatic species, flood control, and groundwater. Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a would reduce impacts on marine navigation by development and implementation of site-specific construction traffic management plans, including specific measures related to management of barges and stipulations to notify the commercial and leisure boating communities of proposed barge operations in the waterways. Impacts and associated mitigation to aquatic species are discussed in Chapter 11, Final EIR/EIS. For additional information on the relationship between the proposed project and Flood protections in the Delta, please see Final EIR/EIS Appendix 6A BDCP/California WaterFix Coordination with Flood Management Requirements. Also, for more information regarding groundwater impacts and their associated mitigation of the proposed project please see Chapter 7, Final EIR/EIS. Several comments raised in this letter relate to testimony received during the hearing proceedings regarding petition filed by the Department of Water Resources and U.S. Bureau of

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
			Reclamation requesting change in point of diversion for the CA 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. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 2	I first learned of the plans to revise California's plumbing system, Delta included, in August 2008, at a meeting at the Ryde Hotel were Delta citizens were introduced to the "Delta Vision" Plan. Delta Vision documents contained several important false statements regarding Delta history, Delta flows and Delta use. Data for the Delta Vision incorrect data came from another previously unknown (to me) document series, the DRMS Phase 1 Report, and also the Flooded Islands Feasibilities reports. Upon review of the technical data for DRMS Phase 1, by myself and many other concerned Delta and California citizens, it was established the baseline data used for DRMS Phase 1, and therefore Delta Vision, the "Pulse of the Bay-Delta", and other publications also all were based on the false baseline data6. The BDCP thereafter utilized and built upon the false data with the result that in several important areas or topics the BDCP starts with incorrect baselines and then compounds the mistake by continuing to build on the false data. DWR representatives were advised of some of the false data in use; however Delta Vision and DWR spokespersons continued to intentionally spread the false data for media purposes, and intentionally distributed the false data to other "scientists" and organizations such that there is an expanding library of evidence showing how the false data has been used, and its impact on the decisions leading up to the issuance of the draft BDCP. The BDCP is or may be a component of the overall new California Water plan. Both document series start with the false baseline data regarding Delta history and some Delta current status, and utilized computer modeling to validate to desired or proposed outcomes. However, when you start with false data entered into a computer program, the outcome is logically based on false data. This comment paper will focus on specific data that was published by DWR and its consultant URS, and how the false or incorrect data has been incorporated into BDCP document and decisions which impact the Delta. In addition to starting with false baselines, the BDCP drafters have failed to recognize and address substantial impacts to the Delta; impacts include the recent past impacts during the BDCP and CALFED site test studies, the near future impacts during proposed end-stage construction, and the long term impacts on the Delta, San Francisco Bay and Northern California especially focused on recharge of drinking water aquifers and long range water rights. One of the stated limits of the "Napa Agreement" was that increase of exports "will not impair in-Delta uses". The increase in exports starting perhaps in 2005 has, and continues to have drastic negative effects on some areas of the Delta, and on the surrounding aquifers as well. Increasing exports has impaired in-Delta uses and also impaired or eliminated water uses in a wider geographic area of the Bay, so far. The degradation of the east side aquifer water quality and levels correlates directly with the increase of exports per the "Napa Agreement", but no doubt the directional hydraulic fracturing also taking place in the Delta and Sacramento River watershed is also contributing to the drinking water aquifer degradation, a subject not addressed by BDCP/WaterFix but a current reality nonetheless.	The commenter also raises concern related to hydraulic fracturing. For more information on this topic, please see Master Response 34, Beneficial Uses of Water, of Volume 2, Final EIR/EIS. The assessment of potential water quality effects of the project alternatives fulfills a primary public disclosure purpose of the CEQA and NEPA process. Please refer to Final EIR/EIS Chapter 8, Water Quality. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS including in Volume 2, response to comments, letter 1656.
Snug Harbor	ATT 2	Just because the BDCP does not address important impacts does not mean those impacts do not exist.	This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS including in Volume 2, response to

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
Resorts, LLC		At a 2008 SWRCB presentation it was stated "Inappropriate inconsistency can result in inequitable treatment, no common understanding of key water quality and water rights goals, and difficulty in achieving a meaningful evaluation of outcomes. "Yet inappropriate inconsistency, inequitable treatment, and avoidance or water quality and water rights issues has been the hallmark of this BDCP/WaterFix/EcoFix process. In summary, the BDCP/WaterFix/EcoFix is the most expensive 21st century packet of false assumptions compiled for the sole purpose of validating the actions planned to be taken long ago. Since historical flow and ecological conditions would not support more diversions from the Sacramento River, by any method, MWD and other water contractors may have sponsored reports utilizing false baseline data, which was distributed to other scientists to be repeated and reused over and over again. When one traces back to the source of false baseline data, you find a trail of lies and omitted information, some of which was clearly intended, others may have been accidental. The trail of lies has become the Tunnel of Lies. Simply go back to 1998 to 2009 and review MWD board meeting presentations that have been available online, and you will see the decisions were already made for construction or "replumbing" actions already underway in and above the Delta. It is impossible for there to be meaningful input by the public when the decisions were made long before the most affected parties, the millions of Delta and San Francisco Bay land owners, residents, business owners and vacationers had no opportunity for input back when the decisions were made. Even more offensive is that the "science" used has been selective, with false "facts" that are quite evident. DWR's DRMS Phase 1 report published by contractor URS is one of the DWR report series that propagated false data by distribution to other scientific or media organizations is an example of "Best available science" that was repeatedly challenged by many which nonetheless was used to validate moving forward with more water diversions even during the CalFed/BDCP planning process. "Best available science" for the BDCP means remove access to historical documents and hand consultants only select data to review (with a short time frame for review), so that the consultant can not, or will not, look for all the facts. The BDCP is based on salad bar science, picking some data and ignoring the rest, to achieve a validation of what was planned to be done anyway, no matter what. Given my collection of literally thousands of maps/map references, when one looks at the series in time sequence, it is just common sense that indicates the long range goals of the few people who control California politics & mainstream media, and therefore its water, intend that the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers be reduced to a series of lakes and reservoirs over time. If you think my prediction is silly, perhaps you should notice the maps of the state in news & weather media, especially on television and online. Note how the maps rarely show any river in California, even when talking about water issues. Note also the historic transition of news and media ownership in 2009-2010.	comments, letter 1656. Comment 3 of responses letter 1656, explains that: "The models, assumptions and other analytical tools described in the "Methods for Analysis" section in chapters 5-30 represent the best available resources at the time these analyses began, with consensus from the lead agencies' expert staff and consultants at the times the methods were chosen. The lead agencies will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats." This comment also relates to issues discussed during 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 CA 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 2	Based on common sense review of the studies and the function of the water diversions over time, I believe the long range impact of the BDCP may be the elimination of many of the Delta's navigable waterways, due to a substantial reduction in freshwater inflow which would render some waterways to shallow for safe boating navigation at low tides. Natural freshwater flows to the Delta, diverted, would sustain the Delta and neighboring counties is a permanent drought-state, at least regarding drinking water aquifers, a topic not adequately covered in the BDCP. In addition, during extreme wet years. The proposed BDCP/WaterFix/EcoFix structures could result in substantial risk of flood of islands that have not flooded in over 100 years. If approved, the BDCP/WaterFix actions in effect tells Californians that the promise from the 1930's through 1960's that only "surplus" river flows would be diverted to Southern California is no longer a promise the state government plans to honor. The graphic shown is from one of	For information on the baseline assumptions, please see Master Response 1, Environmental Baselines, of Volume 2, Final EIR/EIS. The Clean Water Act section 404 and 401 regulatory compliance processes are separate from the CEQA/NEPA process, involve their own procedures and policies. Please also see comments 1 and 2 above for the Snug Harbor letter. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS including in Volume 2, response to

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		the DWR presentations leading up to the DSC and BDCP plans, and shows the attitude of the water contractor-paid scientists towards questions or input by Delta farmers, business owners and residents. It is funny but derogatory. Ironically, it is Delta people like me who are challenging the veracity of the baseline data using, admittedly, the old fashioned tools of truth, factual data and common sense. Will USACE treat our input the same way as DWR has? Will USACE repeat DWR pattern of publication of false baseline data or will USACE claim there isn't enough time or budget to review and correct the false baseline data used for the BDCP EIR/EIS, and also the WaterFix revisions that do not address the baseline issues?	comments, letter 1656.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 2	I also wish to point out that during a time of drought, when aquatic fish species are going extinct due to low water flows in the natural rivers and streams of Northern California, MWD has managed to increase its surface water storage as noted in their comments on this same project. That increase of water in storage had to come from somewhere, and it indicates that what has been diverted and reported as exports from the Delta may be different from what amount of water was diverted in reality. Part of it may have come from the trading of "surplus" between MWD and Westlands Water District, which means it is nonetheless Delta water that was exported.	This comment does not raise any environmental issues related to the Final EIR/EIS.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 2	Focus 1: FALSE BASELINE DATA USED IN THE BDCP EIR/EIS regarding Surface water flow and export data, Chapter 5, Water Supply: The following comments address sections of the BDCP EIR/EIS that used false or substantially incorrect baseline data upon which decisions may have been made. Each issue involves a large volume of research documents, so I provide reference to the online location of those documents and incorporate those documents and pages by reference. The following reflects my opinion based on extensive review of documents related to the subject that were printed prior to 1998, generally, as that is the year it appears to me historical data began to be manipulated or eliminated from the scientific review and computer modeling for CALFED/BDCP/Delta Plan. Chapter 5 focuses on Water Supply, including SWP and CVP Facilities and Operations. Please note page 5-25 which defines the baseline criteria used for determining the computer modeling, charts and outcome assessments. Note also that the BDCP EIR/EIS was published November 2013, the same time as the DWR 2013 updated Water Plan. Therefore BDCP EIR/EIS would logically use the water inflow, outflow and exports published and reported by DWR at that time. From page 5-25: "Delta Water Exports Delta exports and water deliveries to SWP and CVP contractors have increased since the CVP provided initial water deliveries starting in the 1940s. As described previously, California water demand has continued to increase as a consequence of population growth, expanded agricultural acreage in production, and, more recently, the dedication of water supplies for environmental needs. Figure 5-2 shows the increasing trend in annual Delta exports for the period 1956 through 2009 for CVP, SWP, Contra Costa Water District, and the North Bay Aqueduct. The figure also shows a timeline of the major changes that have affected water supplies and demands, such as the construction of the SWP in 1968 and CVP construction of the San Felipe Unit, as well as the implementation of the CVPIA. Exports exceeded 6 MAF in only a single year prior to 2000." Page 5-51 is a chart of water transfers through 2012, showing the data available for use for the study. Page 5-57 begins the discussion of Environmental effects for different alternatives and no alternative. The "no alternative" is presumed to be based on current inflows and outflows and exports as of the 2013 data published, which are neither correctly reported or disclosed in	For information on the baseline assumptions, please see Master Response 1, Environmental Baselines of Volume 2, Final EIR/EIS. For more information on the modeling, please see Master Response 30, Modeling, of Volume 2, Final EIR/EIS. Note that inputs to CALSIM II include water diversion requirements (demands), stream accretions and depletions, rim basin inflows, irrigation efficiencies, return flows, non-recoverable losses, and groundwater operations. Sacramento Valley and tributary rim basin hydrologies are developed using a process designed to adjust the historical sequence of monthly stream flows over an 82- year period (1922 to 2003) to represent a sequence of flows at a future level of development. The Existing Conditions model simulation was developed assuming Year 2009 level of development and regulatory conditions. The Existing Conditions assumptions include existing facilities and ongoing programs that existed as of February 13, 2009 (publication date of the Notice of Preparation and Notice of Intent) that could affect or could be affected by implementation of the Alternatives. CALSIM II model includes the historical hydrology with modifications for the operations upstream of the rim reservoirs, for the Existing Conditions run. For more information on assumptions used in the baseline hydrological modeling to produce estimates of river flows and diversions, reservoir storage, Delta flows and exports, Delta inflow and outflow, and deliveries to project users, please see Appendix 5A of the FEIR/EIS. This appendix also describes some of the limitations and uncertainties of the FEIR/EIS modeling. 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
		the BDCP EIR/EIS. Page 161, Table 5-4, labeled Water Supply Summary Table uses as a baseline the following, as shown in the screen print below. Yet the numbers presented, in Thousands of Acre Feet, do not make sense when compared to another report regarding water exports published by DWR in 2013, also purporting to represent inflows, outflows and exports or the very important "Water Balance" history table as part of the DWR 2013 Water Plan update. When DWR plan drafters are alerted to the inconsistent data, the DWR response is to simply change the "final" published "Water Balance" table, without notice or errata sheet. The importance of the original "Final Water Balance Table" is that it indicates very low actual Delta outflow since 2006, and also indicates very substantial amounts of unaccounted for water diversions from the Delta. That same "Water Balance" history table has been subsequently changed several times by DWR online, and as of today, November 9, 2015 DWR has resorted to withholding data after 2005 and the table simply says "Under development". Yet the BDCP EIR/EIS provides and export chart through 2009, the "WaterFix" does not provide an updated or corrected Water Balance table or chart, but the flow data estimates are clearly known as the fish scientists are providing reports of salmon migration statistics related to Delta outflow trends, which by the way, appear to correlate with the low Delta outflow Water Balance table first published and removed by DWR. The following screen prints show the Water Balance or Delta outflow table as it was published online in the 2013 Water Plan Update, the subsequent republications, and the current online chart. Which set of Delta inflow, outflow and exports data did the drafters of the BDCP EIR/EIS utilize for determining the effects on the aquatic environment from proposed exports from the Delta? Why are the inflow, export and Delta outflow data so inconsistent for the exact same water years? DWR has not bothered to answer these questions so far, so perhaps the USACE water engineers might want to address this important topic prior to even considering approval of any more diversions from the Sacramento River. The series of screen prints below show the Delta Outflow as first reported in 2013, details on the amount of flow unaccounted for in the 2013 chart, subsequent changes to the data by DWR, use of inconsistent data in the BDCP current EIR/EIS draft, and use of the data by others.	
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 2	Cont. from above: Inflow, outflow, exports and Delta outflow data from the "Final" 2013 Water Plan Water Balance Table was input into Quickbooks and treated as if the thousands of acre feet were thousands of dollars instead. The result is that from 2006 to 2010 there is substantial amount of flow that was not accounted for by DWR, as shown above. 2008 shows only 1529 thousand acre feet (TAF) of Delta Outflow while 4851 TAF of flow is unaccounted for. The detailed full size poster showing the study process is available online. The reported very low Delta outflow would help to explain the very serious decline in native aquatic fish species, like salmon, if the annual Delta outflows have been only between 1529 and 6216 TAF as reported by DWR in 2013. More important to note, also, is that the location of those flows through the North Delta has changed substantially over the last seven plus years as flows that should have gone down the Sacramento River and Steamboat Slough, natural salmon migration pathways, has been instead diverted into the "Yolo Bypass" area for failing fish experiments and ongoing restoration test site locations. Table 5-625 on page 163 says the Delta Exports would increase by 1,016 TAF and Delta Outflow would decrease by 1,072, based on assumptions listed on Table 5-4, page 161, the Water Supply Summary Table that says current Delta outflow is 15,533 TAF and Delta Exports are 5,144 TAF. Yet the previously published DWR reports indicate Delta outflow has been less than 1700 in some recent years, and unaccounted for flows added to the admitted export data	See comment above. 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
		would indicate actual diversions from the Delta as above 10,000 TAF in recent years. Which might help to explain where the increase in water storage for MWD came from. Please also note that the WaterFix documentation, published in 2015, still only charts Delta inflow, outflow and exports through 2009. What about more current data use?	
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 2	Focus 2: Impacts of Computer Modeling that utilizes false, missing or incorrect baseline data: Chapter 5 of the BDCP EIR/EIS refers to Appendix 5A if one wants to review the technical data behind the graphical representations. Specifically, Chapter 5 refers to use of CalSim, CalSim II and DSM2 for water modeling for inflows, outflows, exports and more. Maps, charts and model run outcomes are shown in the Figures for Chapter 5 of the BDCP EIR/EIS. So one needs to look at the baseline data utilized for those models, and you need to assume that since the models were run prior to publication in 2013 of the BDCP EIR/EIS, then the computer models utilize the same flow data as discussed previously. If WaterFix actually uses updated information, from where does the updated information come? Often referenced is the DayFlow site managed by DWR with input by DWR water engineers and their support staff and also the CDEC site for flows of specific waterways. Yet even relatively current DayFlow daily data for select North Delta waterways has been shown to have unexplained gaps in what is supposed to be "real time" flow data from gates every 15 minutes. The screen print below gives an example of unexplained flow data gap on Steamboat Slough off the Sacramento River. Can you find the gap in the data? Similar gaps in data for the same time period of study (March 2014) shows there are data gaps for flows on Sutter Slough, Sacramento River and Georgiana Slough as well. This information was also brought to the attention of DWR water engineers. How often have these types of data gaps happened and why the clear pattern of gaps? Were there flow experiments going on whereby flows into select waterways were blocked for some sort of field study? If there are similar gaps in flow data, such as on Georgiana Slough, wouldn't that help to explain the unaccounted for flows shown by DWR in the 2013 Water Balance Table? Will USACE, an organization that is supposed to rely on accurate information to assess actual risk and outcomes, move forward with allowing fundamental changes to Sacramento River flow that could immediately and irreversibly negatively impact the native aquatic fish species survival?: Take a look at the screen print below from the gate at Freeport on the Sacramento River. It shows flow data read every 15 minutes, using military time. Pay attention to the timing after 9:30 and 12:30. Notice the flow data gap? Flow data for Steamboat Slough, Sutter Slough and Georgiana Slough also showed similar patterns of gaps in flow data reporting. 31Sometime after the above data gaps were brought to the attention of DWR water engineers, the flow data for this gage, Steamboat Slough, Georgiana Slough at a minimum were changed. For the short time period reviewed, from March to March 30, 2014, every CDEC station reviewed showed some sort of gap in data, in patterns and different days, as follows: Freeport data gaps: 3/20/2014 between 10:45 to 12:00 noon; 3/26/2014 between 10:45 to 12:00 noon; 3/26/2014 between 12:45 to 14:00; 3/28/2014 between 10:45 to 12:00 noon. Note that the later 3/26/2014 data gap represents sudden flow change from 8,210 cfs to -1760 cfs in just three hour span-not a natural tide timeframe. (I happen to be on a dock taking photos of 3 anglers and their catch when there was sudden drastic outflow causing extreme low tide and sharply inclined dock ramps which were hard for elderly anglers to climb back onto land from the docks-an impact of excess exports ignored in the BDCP) Sutter Slough data gaps: 3/18/2014 between 8:15 to 9:30; 3/29/2014 between 19:15 to 20:30. Steamboat Slough data gaps: 3/16/2014 between 14:00 to 15:15; 3/20/2014 between aa:00 to 12:15; 3/26/2014 between 11:00 to 12:15 and between 13:00 to 14:15;	For information on the baseline assumptions, please see Master Response 1, Environmental Baselines, of Volume 2, Final EIR/EIS. Also, see the comment above. CALSIM II hydrology is derived from historical monthly gauged flows for 1922-2003. This is the source data for monthly flow variability. DAYFLOW provides a database of daily historical Delta inflows from WY 1956 to present. This database is aligned with the current Delta infrastructure setting. Despite including the historical operational responses to various regulatory regimes that existed over this period, in most winter and spring periods the reservoir operations and releases are governed by the inflows to the reservoirs. Daily patterns from DAYFLOW were used directly for mapping CALSIM II flows for water years 1956 to 2003. For water years 1922 to 1955 with missing daily flows, daily patterns are selected from water years 1956 to 2003 based on similar total annual unimpaired Delta inflow. The daily pattern for the water year with missing daily flows is assumed to be the same as the daily pattern of the identified water year. Correlation among the various hydrologic basins is preserved by selecting same pattern year for all rivers flowing into the Delta, for a given year in the 1922-1955 period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that would result in a new significant environmental impact.

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		3/27/2014 between 19:00 to 20:15. Georgiana Slough data gaps: 3/16/2014 between 17:15 to 18:30; 3/18/2014 between 8:15 to 9:30. To date, there has been no explanation for the gaps in flow data. In any case, due to the published dates of the draft BDCP EIR/EIS the computer modeling had to be based upon incomplete North Delta flow data, since the BDCP specifically refers to CDEC and the DayFlow data for the computer modeling. I am bringing these facts to the attention of the reviewers of the BDCP computer modeling for outcomes or impacts, because if the computer model is based on incomplete or incorrect baseline data, then the reported outcomes are also incomplete or incorrect, if logic prevails.	
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 2	Cont. from above: http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/Public_Draft_BDCP_EIR-EIS_Appendix_5A_-_EIR-EIS_Modeling_Technical_Appendix_-_Sections_A_B.sflb.ashx is the technical appendix, which is based on the incorrect and inconsistent flow data provided by DWR and USBR through CDEC/Dayflow. Take, for example the below cropped graphic from Appendix 5A showing the flow schematic of the North Delta area. Once can visually understand that the flow data input at each of the points will impact the outflow data. Note the publication date of November 2013 on the graphic. http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/Public_Draft_BDCP_EIR-EIS_Appendix_5A_-_EIR-EIS_Modeling_Technical_Appendix_-_Sections_A_B.sflb.ashx page 39 of 301 pages provides a schematic for DSM2., which based on publication date also utilizes incorrect baseline data. Details on CALSIMII existing conditions starts on page 92 of 301. Page 97 delta outflow index. I would like to point out that many different computer models related to water exports and Delta planning may be utilizing the same incomplete or inaccurate baseline data from DayFlow data provided by DWR. Here is a list of computer models that may reference the suspect baseline data. Screen print comes from a Delta Stewardship Council presentation. The revolving door of scientists hired by the DSC are charged to use the "best available science" despite DWR and DSC knowledge that the baseline data used is incomplete, incorrect or misleading and certainly something other than "best science available". I also want to bring to the attention of USACE the fact that there are inconsistencies between the flow data as reported by DWR and that reported at USGS website for the same waterway. This discussion is focused on Georgiana Slough, where it appears every April from 2010 to 2014 there is a period when water flows into Georgiana Slough but does not appear to flow out of Georgiana Slough, indicating a substantial diversion of Sacramento River flow from Georgiana Slough. When this question was brought to the attention of DWR computer modelers, the gage at the Mokelumne River end of Georgiana Slough was broken, stoped being available for review online by non-scientists, and the unaccounted flows and diversions from Georgiana Slough still remain a mystery. The graphic below comes from the referenced study, and demonstrates that perhaps part of the unaccounted for flow from the 2013 Water Balance Table discussed earlier may be found in exports from Georgiana Slough.	See comment above. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that would result in a new significant environmental impact.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 2	Focus 3: Impacts to Delta and Bay area humans, recreation, environment, drinking water aquifer Neither the BDCP EIR/EIS or the WaterFix/EcoFIX draft documents adequately acknowledge or mitigate for impacts from ongoing excessive diversions, ongoing field tests for restoration sites, and proposed additional exports if tunnels or additional surface flow of the Sacramento River is	The proposed project aims to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same to the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		diverted to other areas of the state. Here it does not matter so much HOW the water is exported. What matters is how MUCH is exported. Many highly credentialed water engineers, interested parties, scientists and environmentalists have already noted the proposed tunnels and/or surface conveyance is a flawed project design that only benefits the exporters while greatly harming the lands and population with the Delta and Bay region. To the left is a graphic that demonstrates that almost four million people live in and around the subject area that could be negatively impacted by the proposed increased water exports. One very obvious potential impact is that the fresh water aquifer(s) of the Delta and Bay area would no longer be replenished by adequate Sacramento River flow, so drinking water wells in the Delta and Bay could become to salty as seawater encroaches into the Delta. Not only drinking water aquifer could be impacted, but also the riparian water rights of hundreds or thousands of small family farms and residences located in the Delta region. Below is a screen print from a website that shows the locations of water rights holders in just one area of the North Delta, on Steamboat Slough, Miner Slough and Sutter Slough. Excess diversions from the Sacramento River as proposed would greatly reduce fresh water flow into these natural or original waterways. Water quality would degrade, due to warmer water non-native invasive aquatic weeds would invade the navigable waterways; at very low tides navigation may be hindered during very dry years. Proposed "restoration" projects suggested as mitigation for the environmental damage done could result in waterside plant growth that would hinder flood flows, thereby causing added risk to those in the area in wet water year or high water flows. There are impacts already being experienced in the North Delta, due to already increased excess diversion of Sacramento River water.: Map to the left shows some of the field tests or "bench tests" currently being conducted along Steamboat Slough, as part of the CalFed studies leading up to the BDCP series of documents in public review now. I can show how the "restoration" site such as #3 has already caused flooding and damage upstream of the site. I can show how site #6 is currently causing levee damage along the opposite bank, and that #7 is causing silting in the area. Note noted on the map, but also causing impacts is the Prospect Island restoration area, which functions as a nursery for non-native aquatic weeds that are annually spread around the North Delta in the late fall when higher water flow helps the water weeds to break loose and float with the tides to other areas. Many of the test restoration sites are still in ongoing review and report status. It is interesting to note that the revised BDCP and EcoFix maps focus on areas for restoration that also happen to be prime areas for fracking for natural gas and oil. If one reviews the timeline between the new method of fracking or horizontal drilling was allowed to commence in California, and then look at the "restoration" focus areas from CalFed/BDCP/EcoFix, there is a very strong correlation. So are the tule fields designed to soak up the wastewater spilled from horizontal fracking operations33 or is it just a coincidence that the proposed restoration areas are where the natural gas resources lie? I bring this up because Chapter 26.3 Covers natural gas production from 2005-2009, when more current and higher volume information is available. EcoFix promotes "directional drilling" or horizontal fracking in the Delta-right in the midst of the "hub" of California's drinking water conveyance route.	volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives analyzed in the EIR/EIS only include the use of water from existing SWP and CVP water rights or voluntary water transfers from other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. For more information on State Water Project/Central Valley Project exports and water rights impacts to Delta users, see Master Response 32: Water Rights Issues, of Volume 2, Final EIR/EIS. The proposed project would not significantly impact local water supplies. For information on groundwater impacts, please see Final EIR/EIS Chapter 7: Groundwater. The preferred alternative, Alternative 4A, does not include largescale restoration and therefore has limited potential to create adverse effects related to non-native invasive water weeds. Restoration design and siting will be used to maximize ecological benefits, while minimizing or avoiding harmful effects. Several restoration projects have been successful in doing so. The California Department of Water Resources' Levee Repairs and Floodplain Management Office is responsible for administering levee programs through evaluation and direct rehabilitation of structural deficiencies in California's levee system. Overall levee repairs and improvement programs administered by DWR will continue with available funding. For additional information on the relationship between the proposed project and Flood protections in the Delta, please see Final EIR/EIS Appendix 6A BDCP/California WaterFix Coordination with Flood Management Requirements. Construction and operation of the proposed project would not involve the fracking process. State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to stipulated beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows. Fracking presumably would be an "industrial" use of water. As of the present, hydraulic fracturing is a lawful use of water, as state law generally permits oil and gas operators to engage in "the injection of air, gas, water, or other fluids into the productive strata, the application of pressure heat or other means for the reduction of viscosity of the hydrocarbons, the supplying of additional motive force, or the creating of enlarged or new channels for the underground movement of hydrocarbons into production wells[.]" (Cal. Pub. Resources Code, § 3106[b].) According to the Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR) within the Department of Conservation, nearly all fracking (hydraulic fracturing, a kind of well stimulation) in California occurs in connection with the recovery of oil, and not natural gas. And the vast majority occurs within Kern County. Other areas in which well stimulation has occurred and is expected to continue include the following established oil well fields in Southern California: Wilmington; Sespe; and Inglewood. Based on this information, any hydraulic fracturing occurring in the Delta is minimal, if any is occurring at all. As directed by Senate Bill 4 of 2013, DOGGR recently completed comprehensive regulations addressing the environmental effects of well stimulation. DOGGR also completed an EIR devoted to the subject of well stimulation, including hydraulic fracturing, throughout California. Through the rule-making and EIR processes, the state achieved a better understand

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
			how much water is actually used for fracking in California. Voluntary reporting indicates that the use of water for fracking is minimal. The Department of Conservation estimates that statewide, about 270 acre-feet of water per year is used for hydraulic fracture stimulation activities. For comparison's sake, roughly 5.2 million acre-feet of water a year have been diverted from the Delta, on average, over the last 20 years by the federal and state water projects for farms and cities. EcoRestore actions are separate and apart from these CA WaterFix alternatives. This habitat restoration program, EcoRestore, is overseen by the California Resources Agency and will be implemented under the California Water Action Plan. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously address in the Final EIR/EIS including in Volume 2, response to comments, letter 1656 and 2639.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 2	Focus 4: Use of false baseline data regarding historical Delta flood risk Chapter 2 of the BDCP recounts Delta history and references flood history. BDCP uses the technical data compiled for the DRMS Phase 1 report, which was compiled in 2006 and 2007 and distributed before any review for accuracy. Thereafter a "final" DRMS Phase 1 report was widely published in 2008. Only in 2009, after repeat requests for corrections, did DWR revise the flood history of some of the affected Delta islands. Revisions were made in March and December 2009. However, not all corrections were made, and to this day the incorrect flood data is still in use. Specifically, DRMS Phase 1 falsified flood history for Ryer Island bordered by Steamboat, Miner, Cache and Sutter Sloughs. (Not the "Ryer Island" located in Suisun Bay). DRMS Phase 1 also provided incorrect and at times inflated flood history for Dead Horse Island, McCormack/Williamson Tract and other islands. Any decisions of the BDCP based on the false data of the DRMS Phase 1 report will be challengeable just on that fact alone. BDCP "west side" conveyance option, while not stated as the preferred alternative, is based on the false data regarding Ryer Island flood history, as well as incorrect soil type and elevations for a part of the island. Details can be found at http://www.deltarevision.com/Delta_maps/Floods-Islands-Levees.htm and for a review of the DRMS data on Ryer Island go to http://www.ryerisland.com/images/floods/DRMSf1_wrong_on_Ryer.pdf and also the summary of past studies on the Delta Island floods: http://www.deltarevision.com/deltafloodtimeline.html	This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously address in the Final EIR/EIS including in Volume 2, response to comments, letter 1656
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 2	Focus 5: BDCP fails to use current or accurate baseline data regarding economic impacts to the Delta area, particularly regarding recreation and fishing: Delta recreation and economic value has been greatly undervalued by DRMS Phase 1 and then the BDCP economic studies. The 2007 white paper on Delta Recreation provided to the Delta Vision group indicated Delta recreation added over one billion dollars to the California economy each year. BDCP uses substantially lower numbers but does not acknowledge the reason the numbers were lower was due to the recession while more current recreation numbers would reflect a rebound to numbers at or above the 2007 report. Why are BDCP drafters ignoring the real value of recreation to the Delta and California economy?	The Final EIR/EIS Chapter 15 Recreation provides an assessment of direct impacts on Delta marinas during construction of the water conveyance facilities. Please refer to Impacts ECON-5, 7, 11, and 17 in Final EIR/EIS Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, regarding recreation-related socioeconomic impacts. The assertion that recreation economic value has been under represented in the BDCP Statewide Economic Analysis is acknowledged, but this analysis was not used to estimate the socioeconomic effects of the action alternatives in this Final EIR/EIS. Potential impacts to Delta socioeconomics under the new preferred alternative 4A, can be found in Section 16.3.3, Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the Final EIR/EIS. Also, see Section 16.1.1.6 of the Final EIR/EIS for a discussion on sources of contributions to the Delta economy, including recreation.

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
			This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously address in the Final EIR/EIS including in Volume 2, response to comments, letter 1656 and 2639.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 2	Focus 6: False assumptions lead to incorrect results for North Delta fish migration pathway choices BDCP/EcoFix refers to salmon and smelt migration studies, and repeatedly confirms the concept that fish tent to go with the flow. From 2005-2006 there have been annual fish migration studies, with a focus of determining the safest migration routes for salmonids trying to get to the bay, and incoming adult salmon trying to reach their natural spawning areas in the upper streams of the Sacramento River. Did the fish scientists know that starting perhaps in the fall of 2008 or 2009 there were physical subsurface barriers to natural salmon migration waterways of Steamboat and Sutter Sloughs? If the flow is partially blocked, doesn't it also make common sense that the salmon migration that would have occurred in those blocked waterways will not occur? If the fish scientist were not made aware of the subsurface flow barriers, wouldn't that affect the outcome reports and discussions? How did the subsurface flow barrier across Steamboat Slough affect the migration decisions and numerical outcomes for those tests? In the case of Steamboat Slough, at the confluence with the Sacramento River, Steamboat Slough used to be 19 feet deep, but the subsurface flow barrier renders it 10 feet deep at low tides. Navigation is not blocked but fresh water flow into Steamboat Slough and also salmon migration is at least partially blocked. When DWR representative for proposed "emergency barriers" was confronted about this, North Delta residents were told the flow barrier was "naturally occurring". Soundings and underwater photos indicate otherwise. Shear walls are not naturally occurring. The graphic is from sounding equipment showing the downriver side of the subsurface barrier leading into the deep hold cause by flows rushing over the barrier then gouging out the Grand Island levee as shown. The subsurface barrier has no doubt affected outcomes of salmon migration studies, most likely starting in 2009 or 2010. The existence of the subsurface flow barrier was brought to the attention of a USACE engineer who said he knew of no permits to install a barrier across Steamboat Slough, even if it is subsurface and does not hinder navigation. So the question remains-Who installed the flow barrier, when and for what reason, other than to influence fish migration and water flow decisions of the BDCP? Reference links to studies of Delta barriers and gates over the years shows that MWD in particular has had an interest in blocking off Delta waterways for the sole purpose of diverting more Sacramento River water to the export pumps: http://deltarevision.com/maps/barriers_gates/barrier_gates_maps.htm http://snugharbor.net/barriersandgatesinfo.html http://snugharbor.net/images-2015/barriers/docs/BARRIERStimelinelinks.pdf http://snugharbor.net/images-2015/barriers/comments/AttachmentB.pdf	This comment relates to the commenter's previous suggestion of a partial in-water barrier at the head of Steamboat Slough. The results of the acoustic telemetry studies forming the basis for various analyses used in the BDCP (e.g., Delta Passage Model) reflect the predominant hydrodynamics in the area. A barrier across Steamboat slough was not assumed as this type of barrier is temporary and normally only used during drought years to control upstream salinity migration. As described in the methods for the Delta Passage Model (Appendix 5.C of the public draft BDCP, section 5C.4.3.2.2), Perry et al. (2010) found that juvenile Chinook salmon entry into Sutter and Steamboat Sloughs was in proportion to the proportion of flow entering the junction, so this was what was assumed in the modeling. Future operations of an in-water barrier at Steamboat Slough were not included in the Delta Passage Model. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously address in the Final EIR/EIS including in Volume 2, response to comments, letter 1656,
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 2	Focus 7: IGNORED LONG TERM IMPACTS TO THE DELTA, BAY AND NORTHERN CALIFORNIA A The BDCP fails to address the long term impact to Delta, Bay Area and Sacramento Valley drinking water aquifers for the draining of the Sacramento River for diversion, which does not allow replenishment of our aquifers. Government taking of property and water rights	This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously address in the Final EIR/EIS including in Volume 2, response to comments, letter 1656 and 2639.
Snug Harbor	ATT 2	B The BDCP does not adequately address the ongoing reduction in value of Delta agricultural and recreation lands due to the process over the last five years, and fails to provide for	This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously address in the Final EIR/EIS including in Volume 2, response to comments,

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
Resorts, LLC		adequate method of compensation without excessive need of litigation which amounts to a clear taking of private property rights by government entities. People with riparian water rights in the rest of the state should be concerned about what has been happening to and in the Delta. If the water contractors can get away with the water heist in the Delta, you know your water rights will be next!	letter 1656.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 2	C The BDCP recognizes "short term" interference with access roads, noise, use of recreation waterways and facilities but provides no reasonable means of mitigation or compensation by all affected parties. It appears as if the goal of the BDCP process, not just the documents, is to eliminate recreation in some parts of the Delta. The Delta has been seeing substantial negative impacts from blocked major highways in the Delta throughout the CalFed/BDCP process, and there has been not mitigation for this. Delta and Northern California interested citizens would be wise to review the CalTrans road planning that started in 2004, which if implemented reduces road access to the Delta over time. Note in the 2035 CalTrans update the location of Hwy 12 through the Delta.	Impacts related to transportation, such as highways, can be found in Final EIR/EIS Chapter 19, Transportation. For most alternatives, it is anticipated that most construction traffic would occur on Highway 160 on the eastern bank of the Sacramento River. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously address in the Final EIR/EIS including in Volume 2, response to comments, letter 1656.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 2	D The BDCP is unclear as to which waterways will be lost to boating navigation and recreation permanently, and which ones will remain, not just in the interim period but permanently. Drafters should be required to clearly define and map how much freshwater flow at a minimum will be left in each natural or original waterway of the Delta, and should assure that only "surplus" water not needed to maintain navigation on the original waterways be utilized for export.	This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously address in the Final EIR/EIS including in Volume 2, response to comments, letter 1656, comment 34.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 2	In summary, the proposed BDCP/WaterFix plan is a biased plan based on inaccurate baseline data, and if approved will begin a battle of basic rights under the US Constitution, as clearly the taking of so much water from the Sacramento River to divert to other areas of the state is a violation of land and water rights for all affected parties. USACE would be approving a plan for benefit and growth of Southern California at the risk and detriment to Northern California, based on established false baseline data. Please note that I am including reference to my comments to NOAA/DWR on the BDCP for your reference as well.	For information on the baseline assumptions, please see Master Response 1, Environmental Baselines, of Volume 2, Final EIR/EIS. The State Water Resources Control Board, not DWR, is responsible for decisions relating to water rights. The Clean Water Act section 404 and 401 regulatory compliance processes are separate from the CEQA/NEPA process, involve their own procedures and policies. The DWR and Reclamation have done their best to make the EIR/EIS for the proposed project as fair, objective, and complete as possible. DWR and Reclamation are following the appropriate legal process and are complying with CEQA and NEPA in preparing the EIR/EIS for 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	North Delta Landscape Impacts North Delta Land Impacts 1. Total surface area needed for intakes, tunnels, forebays is 2,700 acres. Chap 4, page 4-8. 2. A total of approx 1,220 acres would be allocated to borrow acquisition and/or spoil deposition [number or locations not provided] with max height of 12-ft. EIR/EIS, page 3C-56. 3. Muck storage areas ranging in size from about 100-570 acres for a total of about 1,595 acres devoted to muck storage. Chap 4, page 4-10. 4. Approximately 166 existing permanent structures would be removed or relocated within the water conveyance footprint under this alternative. This includes an estimated 43 residential buildings. Other structures affected would consist primarily of storage or agricultural support facilities; however, several private recreational structures would also	This section discusses North Delta landscape impacts and the acres required. This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. 1. Incorrect for the preferred Alternative 4A. 2,000 acres (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3-91) 2. Incorrect for the preferred Alternative 4A. Borrow acquisition and/or spoil deposition would occur on areas allocated for other project features, such as the SCCF and RTM storage areas (for example, the expanded area for CCF and RTM areas may be used as borrow sites prior to being used for other project purposes). The maximum height for placement of spoil is expected to be 6-10 ft above preconstruction grade (except for sites adjacent to CCF and on Glannvale Tract, where it would be 10-15 ft), and have side slopes of 5H:1V or flatter. (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-76) 3. Incorrect for the preferred Alternative 4A. Designated RTM storage areas would

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		be affected. One fire station in the community of Hood would also be affected. The physical footprints of intakes and intake pumping plant facilities, along with associated work areas, are anticipated to create the largest disruption to structures, conflicting with approximately 45 structures in the vicinity of the east bank of the Sacramento River. Among the three intake sites, 15 residential structures would be affected. Construction of pipelines to convey water between the intakes is estimated to create conflicts with another 17 structures, including 7 residential structures. These conflicts would be located where the conveyance pipeline from Intake 3 crosses the community of Hood. EIR/EIS, Land Use Chap, page 13-115. 5. Other features including tunnel shaft sites, tunnel muck areas, tunnel work areas, borrow areas, barge unloading facilities, and fuel stations would also create disruptions to existing structures. EIR/EIS, Land Use Chap, page 13-115/116. Table 13-13, Estimated Water Conveyance Conflicts with Existing Structures: 43 Residential; 11 Recreational; 103 Ag Storage/Support; 9 Other (includes power/utility structures, bridges, and other types of infrastructure). EIR/EIS, Land Use Chap, page 13-116.	range in size from approximately 33 to 1,208 acres. A total of approximately 2,570 acres would be allocated to RTM storage and dredged material for the modified pipeline/tunnel alignment north and main tunnels. 4. Incorrect for the preferred Alternative 4A. See Table 13-4 in the Final EIR/EIS for Alternative 4A numbers. 5. Correct (general statement) 6. Incorrect for the preferred Alternative 4A. See Table 13-4 in the Final EIR/EIS for Alternative 4A numbers. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	North Delta Water Conveyance Facilities Components EIR/EIS, Description of Alternatives Chap 3, page 3-53. 1. Three north Delta intakes with fish screens along the east bank of the Sacramento River (Intakes 2, 3, and 5). 2. Pipelines conveying water from intakes to intake pumping plants. 3. Sedimentation basins and solids handling facilities. 4. Intake pumping plants at each intake location: associated facilities include and access road; electrical substation; communication devices; and transformers. 5. Discharge pipelines conveying water from intake pumping plants to an initial tunnel (Tunnel 1) or a transition structure. 6. A surge tower at the pumping plant for Intake 2. 7. Transition structures, such as stop logs and vents, between discharge pipelines and larger conveyance pipelines. 8. Conveyance pipelines between transition structures and intermediate forebay transition structures with radial gates and stop logs. 9. An intermediate forebay. 10. An outlet control structure to convey water from the intermediate forebay to Tunnel 2. A 40-foot interior diameter dual-bore tunnel (Tunnel 2) between the intermediate pumping plant and Byron Tract Forebay.	1. Correct. 2. Correct. 3. Correct. 4. Associated facilities include an access road, fencing and security gates, an electrical building with transformers, switching equipment, a backup generator and fuel tank, storage buildings, communication devices, and an outlet tower. 5. Not applicable to Alternative 4A 6. Under the modified pipeline/tunnel alignment, channels would be used around pumping plants, at an elevation of 29 ft. (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-9). 7. Correct. 8. Correct. 9. Correct. 10. Not applicable to Alternative 4A (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3-147) This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	New North Delta Intakes 1. Three north Delta intakes with fish screens along the east bank of the Sacramento River (Intakes 2, 3, and 5). EIR/EIS, Description of Alternatives Chap 3, page 3-53. 2. Three, 3,000 cfs, located between river mile 37, 40 and 41 with combined length of 6,360 feet (24,000; 1,560; 2,400=6,360) of levee embankment (more than one mile of facilities in four mile stretch). 3. Permanently occupy between 1.1-2.1 acres of in-water habitat (5.1 acres total). 4. Land surface area for each is 60 acres. 5. Rise 55 feet from river bottom to top of structure, with intake rising above river's surface by 2-30 feet. 6. Replacement of existing levees with new setback levees along with dredging and channel	1. Correct. 2. Each intake would range from 40 to 60 feet (ft) wide and 700 to 2,300 ft long (depending on the alignment and intake location), with the long dimension parallel to the river flow. Intake facilities for Alternative 4 (Modified Pipeline/Tunnel alignment) would average approximately 90 to 160 acres per site. 3. Minor channel work would be necessary to install the intake fish screens; the channel disturbance area would vary by intake location and would range from approximately 2.5 to 7.1 acres. Foundation type, dimensions, and construction methods will be revised further when additional site-specific subsurface geotechnical data becomes available. 4. Intake facilities for Alternative 4 (Modified Pipeline/Tunnel alignment) would average approximately 90 to 160 acres per site. (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-2)

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		modification activities. Chap 4, page 4-6. 7. Three uncovered, concrete-lined solids lagoons at each intake, with footprint about 86 ft by 165 ft and 10 ft deep. EIR/EIS, page 3C-10. 8. Pumping plant's total height of the above ground structure is about equal to a 7-story building. EIR/EIS, page 3C-10. 9. Four 10-15 ft high surge shafts 16 ft diameter, requires excavate and export 263,895 cy; excavate, haul, stockpile, and compact 50,265 cy. EIR/EIS, page 3C-11.	5. Intakes would be approximately 55 ft tall from the river bottom to the top of the structure. (Appendix 3C, Construction Assumptions, p. 3C-2). The intakes would typically rise above the surface of the river water between approximately 20 and 35 ft. (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-2) 6. Not applicable for Alternative 4A. 7. Not applicable for Alternative 4A. 8. Total height of the above ground structure is about 100 ft under Alternative 4A (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-7). Under Alternative 4A, a pumping plant would not be included with each intake. A combined pumping plant would be located in the vicinity of Clifton Court Forebay, and would consist of two plants that would each be approximately 180 ft wide in diameter. Pumping plants would consist of cast-in-place (CIP) reinforced concrete structure and a superstructure. (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-6) 9. Surge Towers at Intake 2: Two, 16 ft diameter, rim at 65 ft NAVD88. Proposed height of structure will be 10 to 15 ft above the maximum hydraulic surge elevation. Under the modified pipeline/tunnel alignment, channels would be used around pumping plants, at an elevation of 29 ft. (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-9). This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Cofferdams • In the river to create a dewatered construction area, extending approximately 10-35 feet from the intake face, between 1,560-2,400 feet long, temporarily occupying between 1.6- 3.1 acres of in water habitat (7.5 acres total), replace about 2.6 miles of low value steep- banked and riprapped shoreline habitat, and installed from upstream to downstream, with downstream end closed last. Cofferdam walls upstream and downstream of the intake will remain as transition walls. Upon removal of cofferdams, between 2.7-4.0 acres (12.1 acres total) of the riverbed in front of intakes will be dredged (total dredge volumes not yet determined). Between 4-6 years to construct. Chap 4, page 4-7.	This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. Final EIR/EIS pg. 3-129 - Intakes would be constructed using a sheetpile cofferdam in the river to create a dewatered construction area that would encompass the intake site. The cofferdam would lie approximately 10–35 feet from the footprint of the intake. The distance between the face of the intake and the face of the cofferdam would be dependent on the foundation design and overall dimensions. The length of each temporary cofferdam would vary by intake location, but would range from 740 to 2,440 feet. Cofferdams would be supported by steel sheet piles and/or king piles (heavy H-section steel piles). Installation of these piles would require both impact and vibratory pile drivers; piles would be driven using barge-mounted cranes and cranes mounted on temporary decks. For the purposes of analysis, it is assumed that up to 60 sheetpiles would be driven per day for construction of the cofferdam at each intake site. For further details regarding pile driving activities, see Appendix 3C, Construction Assumptions for Water Conveyance Facilities, Table 3C-2. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Forebay 1. A 925-acre intermediate forebay built near Hood with 5,250 af of storage and gravity flow through an outlet control structure. Another 350-acres for emergency spillway adjacent to forebay. About 6 million cubic yards of each will be excavated to construct the intermediate forebay. Chap 4, page 4-10. 2. South end of forebay an approach channel, approx 1,500-ft long and 1,300-ft wide would connect the forebay outlet to the new gravity bypass system. EIR/EIS, page 3C-23. 6. Approx 6 million cy earth be excavated from portions of the forebay. Approx 4 million cy	1. Commenter is referring to information from the Bay Delta Conservation Plan. Information below from the Final EIR/EIS. a. 204-acre surface footprint (including both the intermediate forebay and the overflow containment area, and electrical substation). b. 37-acre water surface area at elevation 10 ft. c. Active storage volume 750 af. d. A 130-foot-wide emergency spillway located on the east side of the IF would carry emergency overflow to a designated adjacent spillway containment area.

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		of fill material would be required for the forebay embankments (required embankment material would be borrowed from within the the limits of the respective forebays). EIR/EIS, page 3C-24.	e. Incorrect for the preferred Alternative 4A. 1,030,000 cy dredged at the intermediate forebay. Approximately 1,029,000 cy of excavation and 2,045,000 cy of fill material are required for completing the intermediate forebay embankments. (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-64) 2. Water would travel from the fish-screened intakes through gravity collector box conduits extending through the levee to a sedimentation system, consisting of sedimentation basins to capture sand-sized sediment and drying lagoons for sediment drying and consolidation, a sedimentation afterbay providing the transition from the sedimentation basins to a shaft that will discharge into an initial single-bore tunnel, which would lead to an intermediate forebay on Glannvale Tract. It is assumed that at the south end of the IF, the outlet structure would consist of a concrete structure with a gated overflow weir at elevation +10.0 ft. Flows over the gated weir would discharge to a transition structure directing flow to the vertical outlet shafts. (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-68) 3. Incorrect. 1,030,000 cy dredged at the intermediate forebay (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-64). This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Pumping Plants 1. About 20 acres next to each intake with a new setback levee (ring levee) with cutoff walls to avoid seepage, filled to the elevation of the top of the levee as a building pad, and transition levees built to connect existing levees to new setback levees. 2. Facilities include six sedimentation basins that are about 120 feet long by 40 feet wide by 55 feet deep with interior concrete walls, six solids handling facilities about 10 feet deep and sloped sides with a top width of 86 feet and a top length of 165 feet lined with concrete to prevent seepage to the groundwater or adjacent riverbed, transition structures, surge shafts or towers, one or two electrical substations, an electrical transformer, a mechanical room, and access road, and other associated facilities and utilities. Chap 4, page 4-7.	1. Intake facilities including pumping plants for Alternative 4 (Modified Pipeline/Tunnel alignment) would average approximately 90 to 160 acres per site. (pg. 3C-2). Under Alternative 4, a pumping plant would not be included with each intake. A combined pumping plant would be located in the vicinity of Clifton Court Forebay, and would consist of two plants that would each be approximately 180 ft wide in diameter (pg. 3C-6). Under MPTO/Alternative 4, the combined pumping plant facilities are approximately 3,000 ft by 900 ft. Total height of the above ground structure is about 100 ft under MPTO. (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-7) The majority of the site would be raised to match the elevation of the adjacent levee, with an approximate raise in grade of 25 ft. (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-6) 2. This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. Under MPTO/Alternative 4, each intake would include four sediment storage and drying lagoons. The drying lagoon size for maximum case sediment quantity is 350-ft-long, 15-ft-deep, with a 160-ft-wide bottom and 1:1 side slopes. The tops of the lagoons would be level with the site and protected from the design flood condition. Under the modified pipeline/tunnel alignment, each sedimentation basin channel would be approximately 100 ft by 600 ft, and 23 ft deep. The bottom of the basins would be at an elevation between -30 and -35 ft, and the top of the walls of the basin would be at an elevation of +32.2 ft. Uncovered basin with channels would be open to above, and a potentially 3-rail 3.5-ft-tall handrail around the perimeter. Refer to Table 3C-2 for assumptions used to evaluate impacts from pile driving. Type, dimension and installation method of piles are subject to change based on future site-specific geotechnical data and engineering design. Sedimentation channels would contain permanent, mechanical solids collection

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
			systems, and collected solids would be transferred to solids lagoons. Under MPTO/Alternative 4, the triangular-shaped basins with base and height approximately 700 ft, for Intakes 2, 3 and 5. Normal settling depth would be 20 ft. Water would travel from the fish-screened intakes through gravity collector box conduits extending through the levee to a sedimentation system, consisting of sedimentation basins to capture sand-sized sediment and drying lagoons for sediment drying and consolidation, a sedimentation afterbay providing the transition from the sedimentation basins to a shaft that will discharge into an initial single-bore tunnel, which would lead to an intermediate forebay on Glannvale Tract. (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-7) This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Electrical Substations • Three 69-kilovolt (kV), with one located at each intake pumping plant, about 270 by 270 feet with 40-ft tall power poles. EIR/EIS, page 3C-13.	Power would be delivered from the main 69 kV substation at the IPP over 69 kV subtransmission lines strung on poles or towers that would terminate at intake substations located adjacent to each intake structure. Footprints for substations at the intakes under the Modified Pipeline/Tunnel Alignment would be 175 ft by 130 ft. Power poles or towers would be approximately 60 ft tall. (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-10). This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Pipelines • Eighteen (six at each intake) 12-foot diameter pipelines from intake to adjacent pumping plant. Construction using either microtunneling or open-cut trenching, which will use excavated material from the trench as embedment and backfill materials with excess material exported off site (unidentified location). Long reach backhoes, scrapers, and excavators will be placed on levees or on the landside of the levees. Two to four 16-foot diameter conveyance pipelines will carry water between intake pumping plants and other facilities such as tunnels and forebays. Chap 4, page 4-9.	This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. Under the MPTO Alternative, (12) 12-ft diameter pipes or 12' x 12' box conduits would carry water from intakes to sedimentation collection channels (pg. 3C-9) Construction could include microtunneling or open-cut trenching through levee, depending on depth of installation. RTM from microtunneling would be removed using conveyors or pumps and transferred to a separation plant to remove suspended solids, treated, drained and transported to stockpiles. Excavated material, if of generally good quality, would be used as embedment and backfill material. Excess material would be transported offsite. If native materials are not suitable as foundation for the trench, suitable materials would be imported to the site. • Excavate, haul, stockpile and compact 850,559cy. • Excavate and export 1,391,603cy. (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-9) This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Tunnels 3. • A single-bore 29-foot inside diameter tunnel to convey water 3.8 miles from intake 2 to a new intermediate forebay. A dual-bore 40-foot inside diameter tunnel to convey water 35 miles from new Hood forebay to new Byron Tract Forebay. The main construction or launching shafts for each tunnel will be about 60-feet in diameter to accommodate construction equipment. Tunnel-boring machine retrieval shafts will be about 45-feet in diameter and 12-foot diameter intermediate ventilation shafts will be located about every 3 miles. Because of high groundwater level, extensive dewatering by dewatering wells at tunnel shaft sites and groundwater control in tunneling operation and shaft construction	This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. Tunnel 1a has one tunnel bore and one shaft location with two shafts at Intake 2 and retrieval shaft at junction structure shaft. Its inside diameter is 28 ft (with an outside diameter of approximately 31 ft) between Intakes 2 and 3. Intake 2 would convey water via gravity through one 28-foot ID tunnel (Tunnel 1a) approximately 11,150 ft, or 1.99 miles, to a junction structure in the Intake 3 facilities. Intake 3 would convey water via gravity from the junction structure through one 40-foot ID tunnel (Tunnel 1a) approximately 36,207 ft, or 6.74 miles, which allows the flow from Intakes 2 and 3 to be conveyed to the IF. Tunnel 1b has one tunnel bore and three shaft locations between Intake 5 and the IF. Its inside diameter is 28 ft and its outside diameter is approximately 31 ft. Intake 5 would convey water

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		will likely be necessary. Chap 4, page 4-9.	through one 28-foot ID tunnel (Tunnel 1b) approximately 25,180 ft, or 4.77 miles, to the IF. Tunnel 2 consists of two 40-foot ID tunnels (dual-bore) stretching approximately 30.1 miles between the intermediate forebay and two 4,500 cfs pumping plants to the northeast of the expanded Clifton Court Forebay. (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-65). Shafts will be constructed to lower the TBMs to their initial working positions and to support their operation, accommodate construction and construction support operations. For Tunnel 2, approximately 180 ft deep and approximately 120 ft wide. For Tunnel 1, approximately 160 ft deep and approximately 80-100 ft wide (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-65). TBM Retrieval Shafts will be located at the end of each TBM drive to enable TBM retrieval, potentially six locations. For Tunnel 2, approximately 180 ft deep and approximately 90 ft wide. For Tunnel 1, approximately 160 ft deep and approximately 80–100 ft wide. (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-66). Approximately 11 intermediate shafts may be constructed (approximately 1 shaft per tunnel bore) to facilitate tunnel ventilation, access, and safety and TBM maintenance. Constructed between launch shafts along the tunnel alignment. (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-66). This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Ventilation Shafts 3. • Placed approx every 3 miles along the tunnel alignment (about seven locations), 12-ft diameter with a 2.5-ft wide curb approx 1-ft above grade, with approx 150x150 work area and another 600x450-ft work area for TBM retrieval shafts. EIR/EIS, page 3C-20.	Ventilation Shafts will be placed midway between launch shafts along the tunnel alignment. For Tunnel 2, approximately 180 ft deep and approximately 90 ft wide. For Tunnel 1, approximately 160 ft deep and approximately 80–100 ft wide. (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-16) This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Tunnel Muck Storage Areas 1. The boring process creates a plastic mix consisting of soil cutting and soil conditioning agents (water, air, bentonite, foaming agents, and/or polymers/biopolymers). Daily volume of muck transported from tunnel to drying/chemical treatment areas is 7,000 cubic yards per day by trucks running 24 hours per day, seven days a week. Muck storage areas ranging in size from about 100-570 acres for a total of about 1,595 acres devoted to muck storage. A retaining dike (berm of compacted imported soil) will be build around the perimeter of each muck area to ensure containment, subdivided into a grid of interior earthen berms into a system of muck ponds for dewatering which will consist of surface evaporation and leaching through a drainage blanket (2-foot thick pea gravel or similar material placed over an impervious liner). Invert of the pond will be sloped a minimum of 1% toward a leachate collection system, with leachate pumped from the drainage system to leachate ponds for further treatment if needed. Depth of stored muck will be less than 25 feet (two stories high) from lowest exterior ground level and max capacity of individual muck storage ponds will be less than 50 acre-feet. To prevent contamination of underlying groundwater, the invert of the muck pond will be a minimum of 5-feet above the seasonal high groundwater table and an impervious liner will be placed on invert. Because groundwater tables are high, construction anticipates minimal excavation to build muck ponds. Chap 4, page 4-10. 2. Under Alt 4 tunnel muck will increase by approx 41%, but additional storage footprints not anticipated. EIR/EIS, page 3C-18. 3. Estimated volume of muck to be disposed from the tunnels and shafts is about 25 million	1. RTM is the by-product of tunnel excavation using a TBM. The RTM would be a plasticized mix consisting of soil cuttings, air, water, and may also include soil conditioning agents. Soil conditioning agents such as foams, polymers, and bentonite may be used to make soils more suitable for excavation by a TBM. Modern soil conditioners are non-toxic and are biodegradable. (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3-136) The daily volume of RTM that would be withdrawn from the tunneling operations at any one shaft location would vary, with an average volume of approximately 6,000 cubic yards per day. It is assumed that the transport of the RTM out of the tunnels and to the RTM storage sites would be nearly continuous during mining or advancement of the TBM. (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3-136) RTM would be transported and deposited via conveyor and/or truck to designated RTM storage areas, ranging in size from approximately 100 to 1,100 acres, depending on the action alternative. In total, approximately 1,595 acres may be needed for RTM storage for the pipeline/tunnel alignment. (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3-136) It is assumed that a retaining dike and underdrain liquid collection system (composed of a berm of compacted soil, gravel and collection piping, as described below), would be built at the RTM storage area(s). The purpose of this berm and collection system would be to contain any liquid runoff from the drying material. The berm geometry would conform to applicable design guidelines and standards.

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		cy. EIR/EIS, page 3C-56. 4. Tunnel muck areas may be temporary or permanent. EIR/EIS, page 3C-59.	Based on the soil properties, the volume of material to be processed, and the size of the material storage area, the area may be subdivided into a system of dewatering or processing areas. The dewatering process would consist of surface evaporation and draining through a drainage blanket consisting of rock, gravel, or other porous drain material. (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3-137). Where feasible, the invert of RTM ponds would be a minimum of 5 ft above seasonal high groundwater table. (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-76) Leachate would drain from ponds to a leachate collection system, then pumped to leachate ponds for possible additional treatment. (Final EIR/EIS 3C-76) The maximum height for placement of spoil is expected to be 6-10 ft above preconstruction grade (except for sites adjacent to CCF and on Glannvale Tract, where it would be 10-15 ft), and have side slopes of 5H:1V or flatter (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-77). Maximum capacity of RTM storage ponds would be less than 50 af (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-76). 2. Borrow acquisition and/or spoil deposition would occur on areas allocated for other project features, such as the SCCF and RTM storage areas (for example, the expanded area for CCF and RTM areas may be used as borrow sites prior to being used for other project purposes) (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-76). 3. The estimated volume of RTM to be disposed from tunneling operations is approximately 31,000,000 cy (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-76). 4. Correct. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Borrow/Spoils Storage 1. Spoils will be stored in designated areas [number of locations and locations unidentified]. Chap 4, page 4-12. A total of approx 1,220 acres would be allocated to borrow acquisition and/or spoil deposition [number or locations not provided] with max height of 12-ft. EIR/EIS, page 3C-56. Borrow and spoils areas may be temporary or permanent. EIR/EIS, page 3C-59.	1. Correct. 2. A total of approximately 2,570 acres would be allocated to RTM storage and dredged material for the modified pipeline/tunnel alignment north and main tunnels (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-76). This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Concrete Batch Plants 1. Located at project works sites with adjacent fuel stations, each [total number not identified] will be about 2-40 acres in size. Precast segment yards for the tunnels may also be built adjacent to concrete batch plants. A suitable source of clean water [amount needed for each not identified] will be required for each batch plant. Chap 4, page 4-11. Five concrete plants in the southern part of Sacramento County, each between 5-10 acres in size. Up to six precast segment plants: two in southern part of Sac Co and four in San Joaquin	1. Due to the large amount of concrete required for construction and the schedule demands of the program, it is anticipated that the contractor(s) would set up their own concrete plant at the job sites. Five concrete batch plants are expected for the MPTO alignment, ranging from 1 to 40 acres. While it is anticipated that precast tunnel segments would be purchased and transported from existing plants, it is possible that one or more temporary plants would be constructed. If constructed, these would be located adjacent to concrete plants. Fuel Stations would be constructed adjacent to concrete plants and occupy

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		Co. EIR/EIS, page 3C-62	approximately 2 acres (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-79). 2. It is likely that each precast segment plant would require approximately 10 acres for offices, concrete plant, materials storage, and casting facilities. Additional acreage for segment storage would be needed at the precast segment plant site, and could run several times the space required for the plant. The segments can be transported by barge, rail, or truck where these modes of transport are available; however, it is most likely that trucking of segments would be required (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-79) This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	River Barges 1. At least six river barge unloading facilities/docks for the delivery of construction materials (e.g., tunnel segments, batched concrete, major equipment) will be constructed located at: 1) State Route 160 west of Walnut Grove; 2) Tyler Island; 3) Bacon Island; 4) Woodward Island; 5) Victoria Island; and 6) Venice Island. Docks will be about 50 by 300 feet and supported by about 32 two-foot diameter steel piles. Will be removed following construction (no restoration of site mentioned). Chap 4, page 4-11 Approx 3,000 barge trips are projected, averaging 1 trip per day thru 9-yr-long construction period. EIR/EIS, page 19-170.	1. Temporary barge unloading facilities for would be built at the following locations: Snodgrass Slough, Potato Slough, San Joaquin River, Middle River, Connection Slough, Old River, and the West Canal. Approximately 300 ft x 50 ft, pile-supported dock to provide construction access and construction equipment to portal sites. (pg. 3C-79) The docks would range from approximately 0.7 acres to 5.7 acres, and would be supported on approximately 32 two-foot-diameter steel piles (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3-157). Docks will be removed following construction and restored under Mitigation Measure AES-1d: Restore Barge Unloading Facility Sites Once Decommissioned. 2. Approximately 5,500 barge trips are projected for Alternative 4A (Final EIR/EIS pg. 19-1). This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Transmission Lines 1. New power lines from existing electrical grid to project substations for power to operate intakes, pumping plants, operable barriers, and gate control structures. Temporary power will be required during construction of water conveyance facilities. A single 230-kV transmission line owned either by the utility or the Implementation Office will operate the new north Delta pumping plants and interconnect with a local utility at a new substation. Line will extend south from intermediate pumping plant, generally following tunnel alignment, connecting to existing utility facilities at Banks. Construction of 230- kV and 69-kV transmission lines will require a corridor width of 100 feet and, at each tower or pole, 100-feet on one side and 50-feet on the other side for construction and 350-feet about every 2 miles of line at conductor pulling locations with turns greater than 15 degrees. Chap 4, page 4-12. Require 496 new power polls and 509 temporary power poles. EIR/EIS, page 3C-15.	1. Correct. 2. 510 temporary poles (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-12). This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Roads/Transportation 1. Detour roads needed for all intakes, temporary access roads constructed from each intake pumping plant to Sacramento River levee, and permanent roads build for intake site perimeter access road. EIR/EIS, page 3C-60. 2. Indirect effects on existing land uses may also arise from changes in access to parcels of land. For example, the removal of access for agricultural vehicles and machinery could	1. Correct. 2. Correct. 3. Please see Chapter 22, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases, and Chapter 19, Transportation, of the Final EIR/EIS for construction vehicle trip assumptions. 4. As shown in Table 19-25 of the Final EIR/EIS, under BPBG conditions, a total of 23 roadway segments would exceed the acceptable LOS thresholds outlined in Table 19-7 for at least 1 hour during the 6:00 AM to 7:00 PM analysis period. Construction

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		jeopardize the ability of that land to continue serving productive agricultural uses. The loss os access would not be considered an adverse effect under this impact. EIR/EIS, Land Use Chap, page 13-116. 3. All construction related trucks are expected to generate eight trips per day. EIR/EIS, Transportation Chap 19, page 19-35. 4. Level of Service (LOS) thresholds are exceeded on a total of 16 roadway segments for at least 1 hour during the 6:00 am to 7:00 pm analysis period. LOS is a qualitative measure of traffic operating conditions. See Table 19-3. EIR/EIS, Transportation Chap 19, page 19-7. 5. Potential construction site access routes do not currently have adequate engineered pavement sections to withstand construction traffic, particularly heavy vehicles. EIR/EIS, Transportation Chap 19, page 19-13. 6. Construction associated with Alt 4 would cause LOS thresholds to be exceeded for at least 1 hour during the 6:00 am to 7:00 pm analysis period on a total of 33 roadway segments, which is 10 more segments than have at least one hour exceeded under existing conditions. EIR/EIS, Transportation Chap 19, page 19-40. 7. Figure 19-3 shows the study roadway segments that could experience substantial roadway effects. The highest concentration of roadway segments below applicable LOS threshold occurs on state roadways, including SR-12, I-80, SR-4, and I-205. Standards will also be exceeded on several local roadways, including all segments studied in West Sacramento. EIR/EIS, Transportation Chap 19, page 19-163. 8. Mitigation Measures TRANS-1a thru 1c collectively include requirements to avoid or reduce circulation effects, notify the public of construction activities, provide alternate access routes, require direct haulers to pull over in the event of an emergency, limit/prohibit the amount of construction activity on congested roadways, and enhance roadway conditions. However, the BDCP proponents are not solely responsible for the timing, nature, or complete funding of required improvements. EIR/EIS, Transportation 9. CEQA Conclusion: Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a thru 1c would reduce the severity of the impact of exceeding LOS, but not to less-than-significant levels. The BDCP proponents cannot ensure that the improvements will be fully funded or constructed prior to the project's contribution to the impact. If an improvement that is identified in any mitigation agreement(s) contemplated by TRANS-1c is not fully funded and constructed before the project's contribution to the effect is made, an adverse effect in the form of unacceptable LOS would occur. Therefore, this effect would be adverse. If however, all improvements required to avoid significant impacts prove to be feasible and if necessary agreements are completed before the project's contribution to the effect is made, impacts would be less than significant. EIR/EIS, Transportation Chap 19, page 19-164. 2. BDCP proponents will ensure development of site-specific construction traffic management plans (TMPs) that address the specific steps to be taken before, during, and after construction to minimize traffic impacts, including mitigation measures and environmental commitments identified in the EIR/EIS. EIR/EIS, Transportation Chap 19, page 19-164.	associated with Alternative 4A would cause LOS thresholds to be exceeded for at least 1 hour during the 6:00 AM to 7:00 PM analysis period on a total of 38 roadway segments under BPBGPP conditions. Alternative 4A would therefore exacerbate an already unacceptable LOS under BPBG conditions on 15 roadway segments (38 minus the 23 that would already be operating at an unacceptable LOS under BPBG conditions). The effect of increased traffic volumes in excess of LOS thresholds would be adverse. (Final EIR/EIS pg. 19-357). 5. Correct. 6. As shown in Table 19-25 of the Final EIR/EIS, under BPBG conditions, a total of 23 roadway segments would exceed the acceptable LOS thresholds outlined in Table 19-7 for at least 1 hour during the 6:00 AM to 7:00 PM analysis period. Construction associated with Alternative 4A would cause LOS thresholds to be exceeded for at least 1 hour during the 6:00 AM to 7:00 PM analysis period on a total of 38 roadway segments under BPBGPP conditions. Alternative 4A would therefore exacerbate an already unacceptable LOS under BPBG conditions on 15 roadway segments (38 minus the 23 that would already be operating at an unacceptable LOS under BPBG conditions). The effect of increased traffic volumes in excess of LOS thresholds would be adverse. (PG. 19-357). 7. Figure 19-3b of the Final EIR/EIS shows the study roadway segments that could experience substantial roadway operation (LOS) impacts. (Final EIR/EIS pg. 19-207). Rest of comment correct. 8. As detailed in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan, DWR and its construction contractors are responsible for the implementation of the Mitigation Measures TRANS-1 through 1c. Mitigation Measures TRANS-1a through TRANS-1c are available to reduce this effect, but not necessarily to a level that would not be adverse, as the project proponents are not solely responsible for the timing, nature, or complete funding of required improvements. If an improvement that is identified in any mitigation agreement(s) contemplated by Mitigation Measure TRANS-1c is not fully funded and constructed before the project's contribution to the effect is made, an adverse effect in the form of unacceptable LOS would occur. Therefore, this effect would be adverse. If, however, all improvements required to avoid adverse effects prove to be feasible and any necessary agreements are completed before the project's contribution to the effect is made, effects would not be adverse. 9. Correct. 10. Correct. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Yolo Bypass Floodplain Restoration (CM2) 1. Frequent inundation (every 1-3 years) of YB by diverting between 3,000-6,000 cfs for 30-75 days for one or more periods between Nov-May, covering between 11,000-27,000 acres with shallow water. Vegetation maintenance with clearing done in stripes to open	This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. Yolo Bypass Floodplain Restoration (CM2) will not be implemented under Alternative 4A. 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
		areas for water flow and avoid islands, including pruning trees with over 4 inches of trunk diameter up 6-feet from the ground. Sediment maintenance expected to remove 2. About 1 million cubic yards within 1-mile of the weir about every 5-years, with an additional 1 million cubic yards every other year removed inside the new channel. 2. Sediment may be disposed on properties in immediate vicinity of Fremont Weir or be used as source material for levee or restoration projects, or otherwise beneficially used Chap 4, page 4-17.	
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Calhoun Cut/Lindsey Slough Restoration 2. • The Calhoun Cut Ecological Reserves is 927-acre property owned by CA Dept. Fish & Wildlife. Project will increase the area of functional intertidal freshwater marsh habitat. The restoration of the tidal system to Lindsey Slough consists of removing several existing features that restrict flow through the slough and excavate starter channels to restore Lindsey Slough's tidal channel system. Environmental documentation is almost complete; however funding sources are still needed for permitting, design, and construction. Chap 6, page 6-17.	This is an interim implementation action. The non-HCP alternatives (Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A) would not have the same kind of concurrent project effects as described for the other alternatives because the interim restoration implementation actions are not part of the non-HCP alternatives but instead would be implemented separately under the California Water Action Plan/California EcoRestore program. Concurrent project effects under Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A would be only those effects from construction of the water conveyance facilities combined with Environmental Commitments proposed to reduce impacts of constructing the water conveyance facility. . This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Lower Yolo Restoration 2. • Property owned by Westland's and project being developed by SFCWA as a tidal wetland mitigation requirement for the Operational Criteria and Plan (OCAP) Biological Opinions (BiOps). The projects entails breaching levees along the Stairstep Channel and channel excavation to return tidal action to approximately 50% of the 3,408-acre property known as Yolo Ranch in order to restore tidal marsh-open-water habitat and upland and riparian habitats. CEQA documentation is currently being prepared and construction is anticipated to begin in 2013. Chap 6, page 6-17.	Lower Yolo is an interim implementation action. The non-HCP alternatives (Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A) would not have the same kind of concurrent project effects as described for the other alternatives because the interim restoration implementation actions are not part of the non-HCP alternatives but instead would be implemented separately under the California Water Action Plan/California EcoRestore program. Concurrent project effects under Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A would be only those effects from construction of the water conveyance facilities combined with Environmental Commitments proposed to reduce impacts of constructing the water conveyance facility. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	McCormack-Williamson Tract Restoration 10. • A 1,660-acre property bought by The Nature Conservancy using CALFED grant, restoration is anticipated to take place on approximately 1,500 acres. An element of the North Delta Flood Control and Ecosystem Restoration Program, the project is intended to help regulate peak flood flows and prevent flood surges in the North Delta where the Mokelumne and Cosumnes Rivers converge. Project will entail breaching the McCormack-Williamson Tract levees to restore ecosystem function, create floodplain and tidal marsh natural communities, and benefit native species. Chap 6, page 6-18.	This is an interim implementation action. The non-HCP alternatives (Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A) would not have the same kind of concurrent project effects as described for the other alternatives because the interim restoration implementation actions are not part of the non-HCP alternatives but instead would be implemented separately under the California Water Action Plan/California EcoRestore program. Concurrent project effects under Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A would be only those effects from construction of the water conveyance facilities combined with Environmental Commitments proposed to reduce impacts of constructing the water conveyance facility. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Grizzly Slough Restoration 3. • A 489-acre parcel bought by DWR as mitigation for the SWP, located about 2 miles northeast of the town of Thornton. Approximately 450 acres is planned as riparian and floodplain restoration to provide additional attenuation of peak flows in the North Delta. Part of the North Delta Flood Control and Ecosystem Restoration Project Final EIR released in 2010. Funding for the project has not been identified but is needed for	This is an interim implementation action. The non-HCP alternatives (Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A) would not have the same kind of concurrent project effects as described for the other alternatives because the interim restoration implementation actions are not part of the non-HCP alternatives but instead would be implemented separately under the California Water Action Plan/California EcoRestore program. Concurrent project effects under Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A would be only those effects from construction of the water conveyance facilities combined with Environmental Commitments proposed to reduce impacts of constructing the

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		environmental documentation and permitting, design, and construction. Chap 6, page 6-18.	water conveyance facility. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Southport Restoration • The Southport Early Implementation Project will implement flood risk-reduction measures along the Sacramento River South Levee that protects the Southport community and will provide 280 acres of floodplain restoration. Owned by the City of West Sacramento and DWR, the ecosystem restoration portion of the project will satisfy an existing mitigation requirement. Partial funding for the project was secured through the DWR EIP program, however floodplain design and restoration funding has not been determined. A partner agency is needed to help fund the riparian floodplain restoration for the portion of the property that will not be used as mitigation for the flood control project. Chap 6, page 6-19.	This is an interim implementation action. The non-HCP alternatives (Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A) would not have the same kind of concurrent project effects as described for the other alternatives because the interim restoration implementation actions are not part of the non-HCP alternatives but instead would be implemented separately under the California Water Action Plan/California EcoRestore program. Concurrent project effects under Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A would be only those effects from construction of the water conveyance facilities combined with Environmental Commitments proposed to reduce impacts of constructing the water conveyance facility. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Prospect Island Restoration • DWR owns 1,306 acres of island and intends to breach the levees on all sides to restore between 460 to 1,300 acres of tidal marsh, open water habitat, and some upland/riparian habitat. The projects is fully SWP-funded through the Fish Restoration Program Agreement to fulfill OCAP BiOp mitigation requirement and CEQA documents being prepared now. Chap 6, page 6-20.	This is an interim implementation action. The non-HCP alternatives (Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A) would not have the same kind of concurrent project effects as described for the other alternatives because the interim restoration implementation actions are not part of the non-HCP alternatives but instead would be implemented separately under the California Water Action Plan/California EcoRestore program. Concurrent project effects under Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A would be only those effects from construction of the water conveyance facilities combined with Environmental Commitments proposed to reduce impacts of constructing the water conveyance facility. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Delta Flows 1. BDCP will fundamentally change the hydrodynamics of the Delta. Chap 5, page 5.3-2. 2. The Sacramento River diversions into the proposed north Delta intakes along the Sacramento River between Freeport and Hood are the primary cause of BDCP changes in Delta flows. Chap 5, page 5.3-7. 3. The BDCP is expected to result in changes in flows primarily as a result of the change in export location (new north Delta intakes) and its associated specified changes in monthly Delta operational objectives, namely, required salinity objectives, outflow objectives, export/inflow objectives, OMR flow objectives, and maximum exports. Chap 5C.1-1. 4. Reduces some Sacramento River flows. Chap 5, page 5.3-2. 5. Overall, there would be minimal upstream changes but some substantial shifts in how water moves through the Delta. Chap 5, page 5C.0-1. 6. Restoration of 65,000 acres of tidal marsh (CM4) could result in changes in turbity and tidal excursion in specific Delta locations and subregions. Chap 5, page 5C.0-2. 7. In the North Delta, flow patters will be altered by the increased diversions to the Yolo Bypass (CM2) and operations of the new north Delta intake facilities (CM1). Chap 5, page, 5.3-2. 8. The average modeled annual inflow at Freeport for the evaluated starting operations was reduced by about 650,000 af compared to existing conditions, primarily as a result of the	1. Some alternatives include possible locations of tidal marsh restoration areas in the Delta which could alter hydrodynamic conditions in adjacent Delta channels, including changes in tidal exchange of saline water from San Francisco Bay which could increase salinity in the western Delta (Final EIR/EIS pg. 5-46) 2. Correct. 3. Correct. 4. Correct. 5. Correct. 6. Correct. 7. This is no longer a component of the preferred alternative which is now Alternative 4A. Alternative 4A includes Conservation Measures 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, and 16. 8. This is no longer a component of the preferred alternative which is now Alternative 4A. Alternative 4A includes Conservation Measures 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, and 16. 9. This is no longer a component of the preferred alternative which is now Alternative 4A. Alternative 4A includes Conservation Measures 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, and 16. 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
		increased Fremont Weir Spills (CM2). Chap 5, 5.3-3. The months with the greatest changes in Freeport flows for the high outflow scenario cases are increased flows in April and May, with reduced flows in June and July, caused by reduced reservoir storage from high spring releases and the goal of maintaining the existing biological condition carryover storage. The months with the major changes in Freeport flows for the low outflow scenario cases were reduced flow in September of about half of the years, with smaller reduction in November in fewer years. The Freeport median flows in January, February, and March for the evaluated starting ops cases were about 3,000 cfs less than existing conditions flows, reflecting the increased spills at the Fremont Weir into the Yolo Bypass (CM2). The Freeport median flows for the evaluated starting ops cases in July and August were reduced by about 3,000 cfs compared to existing conditions flows because of changes in upstream reservoir releases. The evaluated starting ops north Delta intakes allowed higher exports in April, May, and June and subsequently allowed reduced reservoir releases and reduced exports in July and August. Chap 5, page 5.3-4.	
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	1. The general effect of each intake is the reduction of the downstream flow by about 3,000 cfs (when operated at capacity). Chap 5, page 5.3-6. 2. The evaluated starting ops outflows were slightly less than existing outflows because the north Delta intakes allowed higher exports in some months when the reverse OMR flow restrictions were limiting south Delta exports. The monthly median outflows in Oct thru Dec were generally controlled by the required Delta outflow in most years; higher outlflows (more than 15,000 cfs) were simulated in only a few years. Chap 5, page 5.3- 16. 3. The highest monthly outflows were simulated in January thru March with many years having more than 50,000 cfs outflow in at least one month. Median outflow for the evaluated starting ops was about 15,500 cfs in April, 13,500 cfs in May, and 8,500 cfs in June. The simulated evaluated starting ops outflows in July, August, and September were generally controlled by the required Delta outflow. There were only a few years with July outflows of more than 10,000 cfs, August outflows of more than 5,000 cfs, or September outflows of more than 15,000 cfs (required for Fall X2). Chap 5, 5.3-16. 4. These results reflect difference in the timing and duration of spills ≥3,000 cfs under existing and proposed Fremont Weir modifications. The median duration of floodplain over the 82-yr simulation period was 53-56 days per year under the evaluated starting ops scenarios and 13-16 days per year under existing conditions. Floodplain inundation periods of 30-days or more (representing one or more events during the annual flood season) would occur in 58 years under the evaluated starting ops (71% of the years) and 32-34 years under existing (39-41% of the years). In critical water years, median value of 4 days of floodplain (range: 0-34 days), inundation periods of 30-days or more would occur in 3 of the 12 critical years. In dry years, median duration would increase to 27 days (range: 0-56 days) compared to 0 days under existing, with 30-days or more of inundation in 6-7 of the 18 dry years. In below normal years evaluated starting ops would increase to 45 days (range: 0-100 days) compared to 0 days under existing, with 30-days or more inundation in 10-11 of the 14 dry water years. In above normal years median duration increase to 99-104 days (range: 32-133 days) compared to 38-52 days in existing conditions, with 30-days or more inundation occur in all above normal years (12 years) under evaluated starting ops and 7-9 of the 12 years under existing conditions. In wet years median duration in evaluated starting ops is 123-126 days (range: 67-175 days), with 30-days or more inundation occurring in all above normal years (26 years) under evaluated starting ops and 25 of 26 years under existing conditions. Chap 5, page 5C.5.4-	1. This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. The bypass flow requirements and other operational criteria that would control the amount of diversion allowed at the proposed intakes are described in the Chapter 3 and Appendix 5A of the EIR/EIS. 2. This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. The expected changes in the Delta outflow under Alternative 4A relative to the No Action Alternative are described in the Chapter 5 of the EIR/EIS. 3. This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. The expected changes in the Delta outflow under Alternative 4A relative to the No Action Alternative are described in the Chapter 5 of the EIR/EIS. 4. This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. Fremont Weir operations under Alternative 4A are consistent with the No Action Alternative as noted in Chapter 3 and Appendix 5A of the EIR/EIS. The expected changes in the Yolo Bypass flows under Alternative 4A relative to the No Action Alternative are described in the Chapter 5 of the EIR/EIS. 5. This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. Fremont Weir operations under Alternative 4A are consistent with the No Action Alternative as noted in Chapter 3 and Appendix 5A of the EIR/EIS. The expected changes in the Yolo Bypass flows under Alternative 4A relative to the No Action Alternative are described in the Chapter 5 of the EIR/EIS. 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
		18. Overall, proposed operation of Fremont notch extended the duration of spills from 78 days under the EBC2_LLT to 117 days under the ESO_LLT, and the duration of floodplain inundation from 85 to 124 days, respectively. Chap 5, page 5C.5.4-28.	
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Water Surface 1. Proposed tidal restoration will add substantial increment to the existing Delta surface area at high tide (+4 feet) and low tide (-2 feet). The mean higher water surface area upstream of Martinez will increase from about 90,000 acres to about 140,000 acres, an increase of more than 55%. The mean lower water surface area will increase from about 83,000 acres to 115,000 acres, an increase of more than 39%.Significant simulated increases tidal flow at the mouth of Montezuma Slough (+100%). Chipps Island (West Delta ROA), the tidal flows were reduced by about 5% as a result of Suisun Marsh restoration. The Suisun tidal restoration also caused tidal muting (reduced tidal amplitude and reduced tidal flows) throughout the Delta. Chap 5, page 5.3-37. Tidal flows in the lower Sac River (West Delta ROA) were reduced by the downstream restoration in Suisun Marsh and were increased by the upstream restoration in Cache- Slough ROA. The net effect on tidal flows was an increase of about 3% in the lower Sac River flows. Tidal flows in the lower SJR (West Delta ROA) were reduced by about 10%. Simulated tidal elevations will be muted and tidal flows will be reduced in the Sac River. The tidal range (high tide to low tide elevation) was reduced from about 2 feet to about 1.5 feet. The flows were always positive, but the tidal variation was reduced from 6,000 cfs to about 5,000 cfs. Chap 5, page 5.3-37	This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. Please see Final EIR/EIS Chapter 5, Water Supply, and Final EIR/EIS Chapter 6, Surface Water and associated appendices for the most up to date modeling information for the new preferred alternative, Alternative 4A. Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A, also known as California WaterFix, has been developed in response to public and agency input and is the new CEQA Preferred Alternative. Alternative 4A is also the NEPA Preferred Alternative, a designation that was not attached to any of the alternatives presented in the 2013 Public Draft BDCP Draft EIR/EIS. Alternative 4 (AKA BDCP) remains a potentially viable alternative and was carried forward in this Final EIR/EIS because it represents the original habitat conservation plan/natural community conservation plan (HCP/NCCP) alternative approach, and because it provides an important reference point from which the Alternative 4A, 2D, and 5A descriptions and analyses were developed. If DWR and Reclamation ultimately choose the alternative implementation strategy and select an alternative presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS after completing the CEQA and NEPA processes, elements of the conservation plan contained in the alternatives in the 2013 BDCP Draft EIR/EIS may be utilized by other programs for implementation of the long term conservation efforts. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	A decrease of 6,000 cfs in the Sacramento River could result in as much as a 3-foot reduction in river stage, although understanding of how notch flows would affect river stage is incomplete. Chap 5, page 5C.5.4-6. *** The tunnels call for 9000 cfs export, so would that result in a 4.5 foot reduction in river stage? If operated at capacity, or 15,000 cfs, doesn't that equate to -6.5 or worse reduction in tide?	This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. Please see Final EIR/EIS Chapter 5, Water Supply, and Final EIR/EIS Chapter 6, Surface Water and associated appendices for the most up to date modeling information for the new preferred alternative, Alternative 4A. Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A, also known as California WaterFix, has been developed in response to public and agency input and is the new CEQA Preferred Alternative. Alternative 4A is also the NEPA Preferred Alternative, a designation that was not attached to any of the alternatives presented in the 2013 Public Draft BDCP Draft EIR/EIS. Alternative 4 (AKA BDCP) remains a potentially viable alternative and was carried forward in this Final EIR/EIS because it represents the original habitat conservation plan/natural community conservation plan (HCP/NCCP) alternative approach, and because it provides an important reference point from which the Alternative 4A, 2D, and 5A descriptions and analyses were developed. If DWR and Reclamation ultimately choose the alternative implementation strategy and select an alternative presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS after completing the CEQA and NEPA processes, elements of the conservation plan contained in the alternatives in the 2013 BDCP Draft EIR/EIS may be utilized by other programs for implementation of the long term conservation efforts. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
			was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Salinity 1. There may be changes in salinity in some Delta locations caused by tidal flow missing effect from restoration actions and sea level rise. Chap 5, page 5.3-3. 2. Delta outflow is the primary driver of salinity in the Delta and of the X2 position. Chap 5, page 5.3-16. If there is no freshwater outflow in summer months on the lower Sacramento between Walnut Grove and Viera's, nor on Steamboat and Sutter Sloughs, how much salinity will encroach into these historically freshwater areas? 3. In addition to flows from new north Delta intakes, BDCP habitat restoration may modify hydrodynamics in the Delta. These hydrodynamic changes in turn can change salinities, DO, turbidity, and flows. Chap 5, page 5C.1-1. 9. Because Delta outflow is the major factor determining salinity in the Delta channels, these salinity objectives are satisfied by increasing Delta outflow (normally by reducing exports). The D-1641 salinity objectives are assumed to apply to the EBC and the BDCP cases (ELT and LLT). Chap 5, page 5C.2-4.	1. This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP which included many more acres of restoration. 2. Correct. Salinity intrusion is discussed in more detail in Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the Final EIR/EIS. 3. Correct. 4. Correct. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Pumping/Water Ops New North Delta Intakes 1. Operations result in changes in flow and potentially changes in water quality, habitat, and predation. Chap 4, page 4-20. 2. The general effect of each north Delta intake is the reduction of the downstream flow by about 3,000 cfs (when operated at capacity). Chap 5, page 5.3-6. 5. Always a downstream "bypass flow" requirement (e.g. 5,000 cfs in July thru Sept; 7,000 cfs in October thru Nov; and 10,000 cfs December thru June). Chap 5, page 5.3-7.	1. This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. The bypass flow requirements and other operational criteria that would control the amount of diversion allowed at the proposed intakes are described in the Chapter 3 and Appendix 5A of the Final EIR/EIS. The expected changes in the flows under Alternative 4A relative to the No Action Alternative are described in the Chapter 5 of the Final EIR/EIS. 2. This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. The bypass flow requirements and other operational criteria that would control the amount of diversion allowed at the proposed intakes are described in the Chapter 3 and Appendix 5A of the Final EIR/EIS. The expected changes in the flows under Alternative 4A relative to the No Action Alternative are described in the Chapter 5 of the Final EIR/EIS. 3. This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. The bypass flow requirements and other operational criteria that would control the amount of diversion allowed at the proposed intakes are described in the Chapter 3 and Appendix 5A of the Final EIR/EIS. The expected changes in the flows under Alternative 4A relative to the No Action Alternative are described in the Chapter 5 of the Final EIR/EIS. Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A, also known as California WaterFix, has been developed in response to public and agency input and is the new CEQA Preferred Alternative. Alternative 4A is also the NEPA Preferred Alternative, a designation that was not attached to any of the alternatives presented in the 2013 Public Draft BDCP Draft EIR/EIS. Alternative 4 (AKA BDCP) remains a potentially viable alternative and was carried forward in this Final EIR/EIS because it represents the original habitat conservation plan/natural community conservation plan (HCP/NCCP) alternative approach, and because it provides an important reference point from which the Alternative 4A, 2D, and 5A descriptions and analyses were developed. If DWR and Reclamation ultimately choose the alternative implementation strategy and select an alternative presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS after completing the CEQA and NEPA processes, elements of the

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
			conservation plan contained in the alternatives in the 2013 BDCP Draft EIR/EIS may be utilized by other programs for implementation of the long term conservation efforts. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	2. • There almost always will be a net downstream tidal flow (sweeping velocity) below the operating north Delta intakes [doesn't say when or how often or why there won't be downstream tidal flow below intakes]. Chap 5, page 5.3-7. Imagine that the lowest of the intakes on the Sacramento River is operated full blast which then has the effect of pulling the water down river, creating greater velocity at the upper pumps. This is one way all freshwater could be diverted from the Sacramento River north of Walnut Grove. Require that the intake pumps be surface pumps, not bottom pumps, to assure fresh water is left on the Sacramento River?	This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. By meeting the sweeping velocity requirements, which was assumed as 0.4 ft/s in the downstream direction, there will be almost always a net downstream tidal flow when the intakes are operating. If the tidal flow is not in the downstream direction or less than the proposed sweeping velocity constraint, then the diversions at the proposed intakes would be adjusted appropriately to meet the requirements. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	• Modeling of the intakes included a downstream sweeping velocity criteria of 0.4 foot per second. Chap 5, page 5.3-7. How many cfs is this and why the change to a different reporting method?	This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. The sweeping velocity criteria is another criteria that governs the diversions at the proposed north Delta intakes in addition to the bypass flow requirement. The bypass flow requirements and other operational criteria that would control the amount of diversion allowed at the proposed intakes are described in Final EIR/EIS Chapter 3 and Appendix 5A 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	4. • Major north Delta diversions could not begin until the Sacramento River flow was greater than a threshold of about 10,000-15,000 cfs. Chap 5, page 5C.2-5. For example, with a Sacramento River flow of 10,000 cfs, the allowable north Delta diversion would be 5,000 cfs in July thru Sep and 3,000 cfs in Oct thru Nov. With a Sac River flow of 15,000 cfs, the allowable diversion would be 10,000 cfs in July thru Sept and 8,000 cfs in Oct thru Nov. Chap 5, page 5C.2-6. Leaves 5,000 cfs of flow for Steamboat, Sutter, Lower Sacramento, Georgiana…not enough!!!	This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. Alternative 4A proposes a north Delta diversion of maximum 9000 cfs capacity. The bypass flow requirements and other operational criteria that would control the amount of diversion allowed at the proposed intakes are described in Final EIR/EIS Chapter 3 and Appendix 5A of the Final EIR/EIS. The expected changes in the flows under Alternative 4A relative to the No Action Alternative are described in the Chapter 5 of the Final EIR/EIS. Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A, also known as California WaterFix, has been developed in response to public and agency input and is the new CEQA Preferred Alternative. Alternative 4A is also the NEPA Preferred Alternative, a designation that was not attached to any of the alternatives presented in the 2013 Public Draft BDCP Draft EIR/EIS. Alternative 4 (AKA BDCP) remains a potentially viable alternative and was carried forward in this Final EIR/EIS because it represents the original habitat conservation plan/natural community conservation plan (HCP/NCCP) alternative approach, and because it provides an important reference point from which the Alternative 4A, 2D, and 5A descriptions and analyses were developed. If DWR and Reclamation ultimately choose the alternative implementation strategy and select an alternative presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS after completing the CEQA and NEPA processes, elements of the conservation plan contained in the alternatives in the 2013 BDCP Draft EIR/EIS may be utilized by other programs for implementation of the long term conservation efforts. 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	3. The north Delta diversions are often limited by the monthly inflow hydrology and the D-1641 outflow objectives and the operating rules include monthly minimum bypass flows for new intakes to reduce the effects of their diversions on migrating Sacramento River fish. Chap 5, page 5.3-7. Require water monitoring stations to be installed at lower Steamboat Slough and on the Sacramento River below Viera's. Monitors surface and bottom water quality and flow. Constant reporting of the conditions will be available to the public online. Independent water engineer/contractor to maintain and provide reports, or NDWA designates a board member to oversee the work. Costs paid for by state water contractors. Salinity, water temperature must constantly be monitored along with water level. If water salinity violates 1641, pumps are shut off. If water level is to low, which raises the water temperature, which in turn kills the native fish like adult salmon, the pumps area shut off. If navigation of the waterways is impeded, DWR must dredge or else shut off pumps. If low freshwater flow results in increase of tules or water weeds which capture sediment which then raises the river bed, DWR must dredge, remove the sediment and snags, and shut off pumps until such time as the navigable waterways are restored to their pre-1990 depth.	Commenter expresses their desire for monitoring stations, public reporting of results, and pump shot off when salinity and water temperature levels are violated. Please refer to Final EIR/EIS Chapter 8, Water Quality, for up to date water quality impacts and proposed monitoring and mitigation for water quality impacts. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	1. There will be some level of north Delta diversions in almost every month with 9,000 cfs in at least 10% of the years in the months of January thru June. Chap 5, page 5.3-7. 2. Full diversions of 9,000 cfs would be allowed in July-Sept with a Sac River flow of 20,000 cfs, would be allowed in Oct-Nov with river flow of 22,000 cfs, allowed Dec- April for level III diversions with flow of 40,000 cfs and allowed May-June with flow of 27,500 cfs. Chap 5, page 5C.2-6. WHERE is the location of the Sacramento River "starting point" for cfs flow which triggers 3. The median diversions were about 2,000 cfs in October, 2,000 and cfs in November; 1,000 cfs in December, 3,000 cfs in January, 6,000 cfs in February, 6,250 cfs in March, 3,500 cfs in Aprio, 2,000 cfs in May, 4,500 cfs in June, 2,000 cfs in July, 3,000 cfs in August, and 2,500 cfs in September. Chap 5, page 5.3-7. •The model assumed that there would be some level of south Delta exports in all months. Chap 5, page 5.3-7.	This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A, also known as California WaterFix, has been developed in response to public and agency input and is the new CEQA Preferred Alternative. Alternative 4A is also the NEPA Preferred Alternative, a designation that was not attached to any of the alternatives presented in the 2013 Public Draft BDCP Draft EIR/EIS. Alternative 4 (AKA BDCP) remains a potentially viable alternative and was carried forward in this Final EIR/EIS because it represents the original habitat conservation plan/natural community conservation plan (HCP/NCCP) alternative approach, and because it provides an important reference point from which the Alternative 4A, 2D, and 5A descriptions and analyses were developed. If DWR and Reclamation ultimately choose the alternative implementation strategy and select an alternative presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS after completing the CEQA and NEPA processes, elements of the conservation plan contained in the alternatives in the 2013 BDCP Draft EIR/EIS may be utilized by other programs for implementation of the long term conservation efforts. The expected changes in diversions under Alternative 4A relative to the No Action Alternative are described in the Chapter 5 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	South Delta Pumps 1. The south Delta pumping was reduced by about half with annual average exports of 2,662 TAF. The median exports for evaluated starting ops were about 2,500 in October; 4,250 in November; 7,000 cfs in December; 4,250 cfs in January; 2,500 cfs in February; and 2,000 cfs in March; 1,500 cfs in April; and 2,000 cfs in June. Median exports under the early lont-term were about 7,000 cfs in July; 5,000 cfs in August; and 4,000 cfs in September. Chap 5, page 5.3-11. The high outflow scenario caused large reductions from the south Delta exports of about 50 to 1,500 cfs in March through July. The reduction in March thru May were required to provide	This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. The expected changes in the delta exports under Alternative 4A relative to the No Action Alternative are described in the Chapter 5 of the Final EIR/EIS. Changes in average annual Delta exports under Alternative 4A (ELT) as compared to the No Action Alternative (ELT) and Existing Conditions are shown in Final EIR/EIS Tables 5-10 through 5-12 and Final EIR/EIS Figures 5-51 through 5-54. The addition of the north Delta intakes and changes to Delta regulatory requirements under Alternative 4A change SWP and CVP Delta exports as compared to Delta exports under Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative. Delta exports would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		additional outflow, and the reduction in June and July were caused by reduced upstream reservoir storage releases to maintain carryover similar to existing conditions. The low outflow scenario caused increases of south Delta pumping of about 1,000 to 4,000 cfs in Sept thru Nov of about half of the years. The increased south Delta exports in these months (following above normal and wet years) were caused by the reduced outflow requirements. Chap 5, page 5.3-12.	years under Alternative 4A (ELT) as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months due to the south Delta export constraints. The range of incremental changes in average annual Delta exports under Alternative 4A (LLT) compared to the No Action Alternative (LLT) are expected to remain similar to the changes observed under Alternative 4A (ELT) compared to the No Action Alternative (ELT), as the LLT only differs from ELT by climate change and sea level rise effects. Total long-term average annual Delta exports under Alternative 4A would decrease as compared to exports under Existing Conditions reflecting changes in operations due to the north Delta diversion, less negative OMR flows, implementation of Fall X2 and modified spring outflow under Alternative 4A, and sea level rise and climate change. The incremental change in Delta exports under Alternative 4A as compared to No Action Alternative would be caused by the facility and operations assumptions of Alternative 4A. Therefore, Delta exports could either remain similar or increase in wetter years and remain similar or decrease in the drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to the conditions without the project. Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A, also known as California WaterFix, has been developed in response to public and agency input and is the new CEQA Preferred Alternative. Alternative 4A is also the NEPA Preferred Alternative, a designation that was not attached to any of the alternatives presented in the 2013 Public Draft BDCP Draft EIR/EIS. Alternative 4 (AKA BDCP) remains a potentially viable alternative and was carried forward in this Final EIR/EIS because it represents the original habitat conservation plan/natural community conservation plan (HCP/NCCP) alternative approach, and because it provides an important reference point from which the Alternative 4A, 2D, and 5A descriptions and analyses were developed. If DWR and Reclamation ultimately choose the alternative implementation strategy and select an alternative presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS after completing the CEQA and NEPA processes, elements of the conservation plan contained in the alternatives in the 2013 BDCP Draft EIR/EIS may be utilized by other programs for implementation of the long term conservation efforts. Please see Chapter 5 of the Final EIR/EIS for further information on water supply impacts and Chapter 6 for further information on surface water impacts. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	BDCP Water Ops 1. Byron Tract Forebay – Limit diversions to two 6-hour ebb tide periods per day. 2. Banks Pumping Plant – Pumping at near maximum capacity during off-peak electrical demand periods, and lower capacities during peak demand periods. 3. Under maximum allowable export rules, BDCP assumes the CVP pumping capacity is 4,600 cfs and existing sough Delta SWP maximum diversion to Clifton Court Forebay of 6,680 cfs with additional diversions of 1/3 of the SJR flow at Vernalis (to a maximum monthly pumping of 8,500 cfs) between Dec 15 and March 15. SWP pumping to the maximum SWP Harvey O. Banks Pumping Plant physical capacity of 10,300 cfs was assumed for the	1. This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. Chapter 3 of the Final EIR/EIS includes the alternative description and operations proposed under Alternative 4A. Final EIR/EIS Appendix 5A includes the modeling assumptions for Alternative 4A. 2. This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. Chapter 3 of the Final EIR/EIS includes the alternative description and operations proposed under Alternative 4A. Final EIR/EIS Appendix 5A includes the modeling assumptions for Alternative 4A. 3. This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. Chapter 3 of the Final EIR/EIS includes the description and operations proposed under

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		BDCP using the north Delta intakes. Chap 5, page 5C.2-3. New north Delta pumps assumed to be exempt from the 1995 WQCP E/I ratio rule that applies to south Delta exports. The south Delta pumping was limited by the E/I calculated with the inflow minus the north Delta diversions. Chap 5, 5C.2-3.	Alternative 4A.Final EIR/EIS Appendix 5A includes the modeling assumptions for Alternative 4A. 4. This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. Chapter 3 of the Final EIR/EIS includes the description and operations proposed under Alternative 4A. Final EIR/EIS Appendix 5A includes the modeling assumptions for Alternative 4A. Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A, also known as California WaterFix, has been developed in response to public and agency input and is the new CEQA Preferred Alternative. Alternative 4A is also the NEPA Preferred Alternative, a designation that was not attached to any of the alternatives presented in the 2013 Public Draft BDCP Draft EIR/EIS. Alternative 4 (AKA BDCP) remains a potentially viable alternative and was carried forward in this Final EIR/EIS because it represents the original habitat conservation plan/natural community conservation plan (HCP/NCCP) alternative approach, and because it provides an important reference point from which the Alternative 4A, 2D, and 5A descriptions and analyses were developed. If DWR and Reclamation ultimately choose the alternative implementation strategy and select an alternative presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS after completing the CEQA and NEPA processes, elements of the conservation plan contained in the alternatives in the 2013 BDCP Draft EIR/EIS may be utilized by other programs for implementation of the long term conservation efforts. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	BDCP Water Deliveries/Exports 1. 1A – Avg annual total CVP deliveries and avg annual total south of Delta CVP deliveries would increase by 263 TAF (6%) and by 237 TAF (12%) respectively, compared to deliveries under NAA. North of Delta CVP deliveries would be reduced by 55 TAF (23%) compared to Existing Conditions. EIR/EIS, page 5-57. 2. 1A – Avg annual CVP north of Delta ag deliveries would increase by 17 TAF (11%) compared to NAA and exhibit an increase in almost 50% of the years. EIS/EIR, page 5- 58 3. The proposed BDCP north Delta intakes will require a third category of Delta rules: rules governing maximum allowable north Delta diversions. The new rules governing the north Delta diversions may increase the allowable Delta exports by shifting the diversion location to the new north Delta facilities, where entrainment issue are expected to be substantially reduced compared with current ops. Chap 5, page 5C.2-3. 4. Because the BDCP will allow higher exports and fill San Luis Reservoir earlier each year, the BDCP will include higher SWP Article 21 "bonus" deliveries. Chap 5, page 5C.2-4. 5. The average annual total exports for evaluated starting ops (early long term) were 5,265 TAF with average north Delta diversions of 2,603 TAF (49% of total exports). The average annual total exports for evaluated starting ops (late long term) were 4,945 TAF with north Delta diversions of 2,435 TAF (49% of total exports). Chap 5, page 5.3-7. 6. The proposed BDCP north Delta intakes will require a third category of Delta rules: governing maximum allowable north Delta diversions. The new rules governing the north Delta diversions may increase the allowable Delta exports by shifting the diversion location to the new north Delta facilities, where entrainment issues are expected to be substantially reduced compared with current operations. Chap 5, page 5C.2-3.	1. Alternative 4A is the preferred alternative. Please see note below. 2. Alternative 4A is the preferred alternative. Please see note below. 3. Commenter is commenting on the Bay Delta Conservation Plan. 4. Commenter is commenting on the Bay Delta Conservation Plan. 5. Commenter is commenting on the Bay Delta Conservation Plan. 6. Commenter is commenting on the Bay Delta Conservation Plan. 7. Commenter is commenting on the Bay Delta Conservation Plan. Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A, also known as California WaterFix, has been developed in response to public and agency input and is the new CEQA Preferred Alternative. Alternative 4A is also the NEPA Preferred Alternative, a designation that was not attached to any of the alternatives presented in the 2013 Public Draft BDCP Draft EIR/EIS. Alternative 4 (AKA BDCP) remains a potentially viable alternative and was carried forward in this Final EIR/EIS because it represents the original habitat conservation plan/natural community conservation plan (HCP/NCCP) alternative approach, and because it provides an important reference point from which the Alternative 4A, 2D, and 5A descriptions and analyses were developed. If DWR and Reclamation ultimately choose the alternative implementation strategy and select an alternative presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS after completing the CEQA and NEPA processes, elements of the conservation plan contained in the alternatives in the 2013 BDCP Draft EIR/EIS may be utilized by other programs for implementation of the long term conservation efforts. Please see Final EIR/EIS Chapter 5, Water Supply, and Final EIR/EIS Chapter 6, Surface Water and associated appendices for the most up to date modeling information for the new preferred

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		Because the BDCP will allow higher exports and fill San Luis Reservoir earlier each year, the BDCP will include higher SWP Article 21 "bonus" deliveries. Chap 5, page 5C.2-4.	alternative, Alternative 4A. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Sutter/Steamboat Sloughs 4. • The median diversions into Sutter and Steamboat Sloughs are lower under the evaluated starting ops because of the Fremont Weir notch increases the diversions to the Yolo Bypass and because north Delta intakes reduce the Sacramento River flow at these two sloughs. In addition, tidal restoration in the Cache Slough Complex was simulated to shift the tidal elevations and reduce the Sutter/Steamboat diversion fractions. The BDCP median diversion flows were reduced by about 1,000 cfs in January, about 5,000 cfs in February, and about 3,500 cfs in March compared to the existing conditions. The reductions in the Sutter/Steamboat Slough diversions were about 40% of the simulated north Delta intake diversions. Chap 5, page 5.3-10. Meaning the water exported directly reduces Steamboat and Sutter Slough diversions by 40%!	Commenter is commenting on the Bay Delta Conservation Plan. Please see Final EIR/EIS Chapter 5, Water Supply, and Final EIR/EIS Chapter 6, Surface Water and associated appendices for the most up to date modeling information for the new preferred alternative, Alternative 4A. Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A, also known as California WaterFix, has been developed in response to public and agency input and is the new CEQA Preferred Alternative. Alternative 4A is also the NEPA Preferred Alternative, a designation that was not attached to any of the alternatives presented in the 2013 Public Draft BDCP Draft EIR/EIS. Alternative 4 (AKA BDCP) remains a potentially viable alternative and was carried forward in this Final EIR/EIS because it represents the original habitat conservation plan/natural community conservation plan (HCP/NCCP) alternative approach, and because it provides an important reference point from which the Alternative 4A, 2D, and 5A descriptions and analyses were developed. If the DWR and Reclamation ultimately choose the alternative implementation strategy and select an alternative presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS after completing the CEQA and NEPA processes, elements of the conservation plan contained in the alternatives in the 2013 BDCP Draft EIR/EIS may be utilized by other programs for implementation of the long term conservation efforts. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Georgiana Slough/DCC 2. Predicted reduced monthly median diversion flows to DCC and Georgiana Slough for evaluated starting ops because the north Delta intakes reduced the Sacramento River flow. The average annual diversions into the DCC and Georgiana Slough were about 3,750 TAF (24% of the Sacramento River flow at Freeport) for the existing conditions and were reduced to about 3,50 TAF (21% of Sac River flow) for the BDCP ops. Chap 5, page 5.3-10. So, of the 5,000 cfs of flow left after the pumps, DCC and Georgiana Slough receive about 1,000 cfs and Sutter, Steamboat and lower Sacramento "share" 4,000 cfs? Isn't this a reduction of flows by 75% for the Lower Sacramento and its natural or original tributaries?	This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. Chapter 3 of the Final EIR/EIS includes the description and operations proposed under Alternative 4A. Appendix 5A of the Final EIR/EIS includes the modeling assumptions for Alternative 4A. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	4. North Delta intakes combined with diversion of water into Yolo Bypass (CM2) inevitably would result in less Sacramento River flow below intakes with potential for greater incidences of Sac River flow reversals in the vicinity of Georgiana Slough and the DCC. Chap 5, page 5C.4-78. What about the effect on the lower Sacramento River down by Viera's? Those same pumps causing reverse flows in the Georgiana area would pull in the higher salinity water expected to encroach up to Rio Vista in some models. How does it affect the water quality at Oxbow Marina? Water levels at Oxbow?	This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. Conservation Measure 2 is not a part of the preferred Alternative 4A. Please refer to Final EIR/EIS Chapter 8, Water Quality, for water quality information pertaining to Alternative 4A, the new preferred alternative. Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A, also known as California WaterFix, has been developed in response to public and agency input and is the new CEQA Preferred Alternative. Alternative 4A is also the NEPA Preferred Alternative, a designation that was not attached to any of the alternatives presented in the 2013 Public Draft BDCP Draft EIR/EIS. Alternative 4 (AKA BDCP) remains a potentially viable alternative and was carried forward in this Final EIR/EIS because it represents the

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
			original habitat conservation plan/natural community conservation plan (HCP/NCCP) alternative approach, and because it provides an important reference point from which the Alternative 4A, 2D, and 5A descriptions and analyses were developed. If DWR and Reclamation ultimately choose the alternative implementation strategy and select an alternative presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS after completing the CEQA and NEPA processes, elements of the conservation plan contained in the alternatives in the 2013 BDCP Draft EIR/EIS may be utilized by other programs for implementation of the long term conservation efforts. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	• The analyses of reverse flows and flow entry into Georgiana Slough were based on 15-minute outputs form the DSM2- HYDRO simulations for each scenario. The results were computed for 16 years, starting from water year 1976 to water year 1991. Flow outputs for Sac River downstream of GS 9channel 423 at 1,000 feet or SAC_370, Sac River upstream GS (channel 433 at 1320 feet or SAC_36), GS (channel 366 at 0 feet or GEORG_SL), and the net DICU (Delta Island Consumptive Use) flow at node 343 were used. Chap 5, 5C.4-80. How does this change when claimed in-delta use is reduced due to sale or transfer of water rights by farmers? 7.	This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. Chapter 3 of the Final EIR/EIS includes the description and operations proposed under Alternative 4A. Appendix 5A of the Final EIR/EIS includes the modeling assumptions for Alternative 4A and detailed modeling results. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Threemile Slough • Modeling indicates Threemile Slough flows are about 3% of the Rio Vista flows under existing conditions and were reduced slightly for the evaluated starting ops because the Rio Vista flows were reduced by about 80% of the north Delta intake diversions. Annual average flows were reduced from 1,000 TAF to about 700 TAF. There tidal exchange of water between the Sacramento River and the San Joaquin River thru Threemile Slough is predicted to remain similar. Chap 5, page 5.3-10.	This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. The expected changes in the flows under Alternative 4A relative to the No Action Alternative are described in the Chapter 5 of the Final EIR/EIS. Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A, also known as California WaterFix, has been developed in response to public and agency input and is the new CEQA Preferred Alternative. Alternative 4A is also the NEPA Preferred Alternative, a designation that was not attached to any of the alternatives presented in the 2013 Public Draft BDCP Draft EIR/EIS. Alternative 4 (AKA BDCP) remains a potentially viable alternative and was carried forward in this Final EIR/EIS because it represents the original habitat conservation plan/natural community conservation plan (HCP/NCCP) alternative approach, and because it provides an important reference point from which the Alternative 4A, 2D, and 5A descriptions and analyses were developed. If DWR and Reclamation ultimately choose the alternative implementation strategy and select an alternative presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS after completing the CEQA and NEPA processes, elements of the conservation plan contained in the alternatives in the 2013 BDCP Draft EIR/EIS may be utilized by other programs for implementation of the long term conservation efforts. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Tule Canal/Toe Drain • Removal of road crossings and agricultural impoundments, earthwork and construction of structures to reduce Tule Canal/Toe Drain channel capacities. Chap 4, page 4-16.	This is captured in the Final EIR/EIS as Component Project 9: New or Replacement Impoundment Structures and Agricultural Crossings at the Tule Canal and Toe Drain. Replace agricultural crossings of the Tule Canal and Toe Drain with fish-passable structures such as flat car bridges or earthen crossings with large, open culverts. Construct new or replacement operable check-structures to facilitate continued agriculture in the Yolo Bypass while promoting fish passage in season (Phase 1, Category 3 Action) (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3-173). This

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
			comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Yolo Bypass Western Edge • Modification of existing configuration of the discontinuous channels along the western edge of the Yolo Bypass to reduce diversion of Delta water for Yolo Bypass irrigation. Chap 4, page 4-16.	This is captured in the Final EIR/EIS as Component Project 19: Yolo Bypass Modifications to Direct or Restrain Flow. Through modeling and further concept development, determine which of the following actions are necessary to improve the distribution (e.g., wetted area) and hydrodynamic characteristics (e.g., residence times, flow ramping, and recession) of water moving through the Yolo Bypass: grading, removal of existing berms, levees, and water control structures (including inflatable dams); construction of berms or levees; reworking of agricultural delivery channels; and earthwork or construction of structures to reduce Tule Canal and Toe Drain channel capacities. The project would include modifications that would allow water to inundate certain areas of the bypass to provide biological benefits to covered species, reduce stranding of covered fish species in isolated ponds, and achieve a sustainable balance. Necessary lands would be acquired in fee-title or through conservation or flood easement (Phase 2, Category 3 Action) (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3-175). This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Head of Old River Barrier Operation Example scenario calls for aligning use of the HORB with the D-1641 fall pulse flow intended to cue immigrating adult Chinook salmon in the SJR system. Will fully close the HORB and suspend south Delta diversion operations during the D-1641 flow pulse in Oct, then operate 50% open for 2 weeks following pulse flow. After (sometime in Nov) the HORB will remain open thru Dec, but return to 50% closed ops when SJR juvenile salmonids are moving out of system. Also, HORB will be fully open when SJR flow greater than 10,000 cfs at Vernalis. Spring months (April, May, June) HORB ops conditioned on flows of SJR at Vernalis. April and May when below 5,000 cfs at Vernalis, an avg net OMR target of -2,000 cfs should benefit salmon and smelt. Chap 4, page 4-22 and 4-23. Navigation limits	This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. The expected changes in the flows under Alternative 4A relative to the No Action Alternative are described in the Chapter 5 of the Final EIR/EIS. Scenario H includes the operational components of the water conveyance facilities under Alternative 4A. The Head of Old River Operable (HOR) Gate Operations/Modeling assumptions (% Open) information can be found on page 3-268 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Cache Slough Complex Intakes At least 5,000 acres of habitat restoration will occur in Cache Slough Complex that will require the removal of an estimated 9 diversions by year 10 with an additional 15 diversions removed by end of yr 50. Habitat construction is expected to ultimately result in a reduction of the total number of existing diversions from 47 to 23. BDCP will remediate about 100 cfs of Cache Slough Complex (Cache Slough, Barker Slough, Ulatis Channel, Lindsey Slough, Hass Slough, Shag Slough, SDWSC, Miner Slough: area of about 29,000 acres) diversions per year up to a max of 5,000 cfs over the permit, thru a combo of removing diversion for restoration activities and remediation techniques including locating them elsewhere in plan area (remediation prioritized per CM21). Area includes about 55 intake pipes and 46 diversion (max diversion capacity if about 1,500 cfs, excluding NBA). BDCP will consider activities associated with capital projects to remediate these local diversions as covered activities with regulatory ESA coverage if the operators have executed a certificate of inclusion. If signed, these operators may be required to allow their diversions to be screened (some may be paid for others no). Chap 4, page 4-26. NBA is also planning a new intake in the area…what about those effects?	The commenter raisins concerns about the North Bay Aqueduct Alternate Intake Project also planned in the same area as the Cache Slough Complex. The BDCP (or a BDCP alternative) would cover operation, but not construction, of the North Bay Aqueduct Alternate Intake Project. The construction of new facilities associated with the North Bay Aqueduct Alternate Intake Project is not covered under the BDCP. Consequently, construction activities will require separate environmental compliance, and compliance with ESA Section 7 and CESA. However, if the project is constructed and operated, its operations and maintenance are a covered activity, provided that they occur as here characterized. Operations will necessarily be an indirect effect to be evaluated under ESA Section 7 and compliance with applicable BiOps will ensure that the facility is operated in a manner that minimizes incidental take and avoids jeopardy or adverse modification of critical habitat. The BDCP addresses the possibility of providing further mitigation for permitted operational incidental take, and operational effects to non-ESA-listed covered species. The Proposed Authorized Entities will address these issues on behalf of the facility operator. This project includes an additional intake on the Sacramento River that would operate in conjunction with the existing North Bay Aqueduct intake at Barker Slough. The project would be used to accommodate projected future peak demand of up to 240 cfs. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
			was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Fremont Weir/Yolo Bypass • Removal and/or construction of berms, levees, and water control structures.	Fremont Weir actions are not included in the preferred Alternative 4A. Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A, also known as California WaterFix, has been developed in response to public and agency input and is the new CEQA Preferred Alternative. Alternative 4A is also the NEPA Preferred Alternative, a designation that was not attached to any of the alternatives presented in the 2013 Public Draft BDCP Draft EIR/EIS. Alternative 4 (AKA BDCP) remains a potentially viable alternative and was carried forward in this Final EIR/EIS because it represents the original habitat conservation plan/natural community conservation plan (HCP/NCCP) alternative approach, and because it provides an important reference point from which the Alternative 4A, 2D, and 5A descriptions and analyses were developed. If DWR and Reclamation ultimately choose the alternative implementation strategy and select an alternative presented in the RDEIR/SDEIS after completing the CEQA and NEPA processes, elements of the conservation plan contained in the alternatives in the 2013 BDCP Draft EIR/EIS may be utilized by other programs for implementation of the long term conservation efforts. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	BDCP Levee Maintenance • Maintained to provide 100-yr flood protection. All levee maintenance activities must be under the jurisdiction of a federal or state agency, an agency created by the federal or state law, or an agency of a community participating in the NFIP that assumes ultimate responsibility for maintenance. At a minimum, levee maintenance plans shall specify the maintenance activities to be performed, the frequency of their performance, and the person, by name or by title, responsible for their performance. Chap 4, page 4-24. Maintaining the levees but ignoring the buildup of channel beds from the sediment captured along the banks growning "restoration" plants like tules will make it impossible to maintain the 100 year flood protection. Dredging of all North Delta sloughs must be included	This comment expresses the commenter's desire to have all North Delta sloughs dredged as part of the project. The project will comply with requirements to maintain and provide 100-year flood protection. Exact strategies for doing this will be captured in levee maintenance plans as they will vary depending upon the area. Dredging in North Delta sloughs will be determined at a later date. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	New North Delta Intakes Impacts • Operations result in changes in flow and potentially changes in water quality, habitat, and predation. Operational impacts on fish may include changes in spawning, migration, and rearing habitat associated with changes in reservoir operations, diversion of water, and the consequent changes in flow in the Sacramento River and water circulation and quality through the Delta. Placement and operation of intakes may also result in changes in the potential for predation. Chap 4, page 4-20.	This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. The expected changes in the flows under Alternative 4A relative to the No Action Alternative are described in the Chapter 5 of the Final EIR/EIS. The changes in water quality under Alternative 4A relative to the No Action Alternative are described in the Chapter 8 of the Final EIR/EIS. The changes in the habitat and predation under Alternative 4A relative to the No Action Alternative are described in the Chapter 11 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Temperature Impacts 1. Temperature, for example, may have a lethal effect, and affects the metabolism of fish, which then require more food and more oxygen to survive. Chap 5, 5.3-19. 2. Comparisons of water temperature differences between existing conditions and evaluated starting ops were not conducted for the Plan Area. Chap 5, page 5.3-20. 3. There will be minimal changes in Sacramento river temps as a result of BDCP and no changes to SJR temps because there will be no change in SJR flows. Chap 5, page 5.3-20. FYI In 2012 local anglers monitored the water temperature on Steamboat Slough, Sutter	This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. Temperature impacts on fish associated with the No Action Alternative as well as Alternative 4A are discussed in Final EIR/EIS Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Resources. 1. Correct. 2. Temperature impacts on fish associated with the No Action Alternative as well as Alternative 4A are discussed in Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Resources. 3. Correct.

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		Slough and lower Sacramento River at the beginning of Salmon season in July through September. Especially on Steamboat Slough, water temperatures were lethally high for migrating adult salmon and hopefully the salmon were wise enough to use different migration routes, probably Yolo Bypass area where the water flow seemed cooler. Discussion with UC Davis fish expert confirmed our concerns that the water temps on Steamboat and Sutter were lethal.	This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Salinity Impacts 1. Salinity elicits direct responses from organisms depending on their ability to adapt to salinity gradients. Chap 5, page 5.3-19. 2. Increased tidal mixing associated with the addition of tidal marsh restoration areas under the BDCP may allow more salt into the western Delta. Chap 5, page 5.3-25. 3. Under BDCP scenarios outflows will be nearly the same during the low-flow months of July thru Oct in many years, so that X2 will remain unchanged. However, outflows under the low-outflow scenario would be lower than under evaluated starting ops or the high-outflow scenario in Sept thru Nov of wet and above-normal years (about 50% of the years). Under the low-outflow scenario outflow would be operated to meet the D-1641 objectives, so the salinity in the western Delta would be higher than the evaluated starting ops or high-outflow scenario. The X2 will move upstream to the historical positions under D-1641. The outflow salinity relationships may shift with sea level rise, so that the X2 position for an outflow of 3,000 cfs or 4,000 cfs may be more upstream than historically observed. Chap 5, page 5.3-26. Relatively small changes in salinity were simulated for the ROAs. Changes in salinity form historical conditions depend on the assumed locations of the ROAs and their connections to the existing channels. Tidal trapping on Grizzly Island increased the salinity at Chipps Island and upstream. Reductions in the net diversions from the Sacramento River to the SJR (through DCC, Georgiana Slough, and Threemile Slough) reduced the freshening effect from the Sac River and increased the salinity at the SJR stations. South Delta ROAs tended to increase the tidal mixing of seawater into the south Delta and to the south Delta pumps. Chap 5, 5.3-26.	1. Correct. 2. Correct. 3. Correct. 4. Correct. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Dissolved Oxygen Impacts 1. The saturation concentration of DO is reduced at warmer temperatures and fish must move water over their gills at a faster rate when water has a lower DO concentration. Chap 5, page 5.3-19. 2. Modeling simulations found only minor differences among the BDCP scenarios. Chap 5, page 5.3-23. Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel is declared impaired by SWRCB. CM 14 will provide shared funding of the long-term operation and maintenance costs associated with an aeration facility will occur. Chap 5, page 5.3-23.	1. Correct. 2. Correct. 3. CM 14 is not included in Alternative 4A, the new preferred alternative. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Turbidity/Sediment Impacts 1. Excessive turbidity can have direct effects on organisms, causing irritation or in some instances suffocation. Turbidity also has indirect effects such as providing cover from predators, or providing a visual background (contrast) that makes prey items easier to acquire. Chap 5, page 5.3-19. 2. Implementation of dual conveyance under CM1 was estimated to result in around 8-9% less sediment entering the Plan Area. Less sediment entering the Plan Area may cause	1. Correct. 2. Correct. 3. Correct. 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
		greater water clarity, although the extens of the effect is uncertain. Capture of sediment in upstream ROAs (particularly Cache Slough and West Delta) could also lead to greater water clarity in downstream areas such as Suisun Bay. Chap 5, page 5.3-24. It is unclear whether sediment supply will be sufficient to maintain the current extend of tidal marsh. Chap 5, page 5.3-25	
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	Impacts Outside Plan Area 4. • Feather River will have lower flows and higher water temperatures due to changes in the timing of releases from Oroville Dam. Chap 5, page 5.3-3.	4. This comment is related to the proposed action under the draft BDCP. The expected changes in the flows under Alternative 4A relative to the No Action Alternative are described in the Chapter 5 of the Final EIR/EIS. The changes in the water temperatures under Alternative 4A relative to the No Action Alternative are described in the Chapter 11 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 3	North Delta Construction Impacts Appendix 3C 1. Clearing all vegetation and other objects on levee, berm and along the low flow bank. 2. Construct detour roads, requires 971,500 cy for impart and compact (five intakes) 3. Widen levee top on landside of levee to provide turnout access for construction 4. Pave levee with asphalt concrete surface over and aggregate base 5. 80,000 cy imported fill, 694 cy aggregate base, and 680 tons asphalt concrete 6. Cofferdam work performed only during the allowed in-river work period June 1-Oct 31 7. Build temporary cofferdam in river to create dewatered construction area between 0.2 and 5 acres 8. Dewatering of cofferdams 24hrs, 7 days per week throughout intake construction, pumped to tanks on the landside of adjacent levees, treated and returned to river 9. Between 450-800 sheet piles driven from within river by a barge mounted crane for intakes 10. 551 piles for sedimentation basin 11. 493 piles for pump house locations 12. From 8-12 pile installed per day, per intake site, requiring about 700 strikes each 13. Excavate from river bed (cofferdam area) an approximate depth of 30-35 ft of soil, for an excavated volume of 22,600 cy 14. Excavate next to each intake structure about 750 ft upstream and downstream 15. Each intake requires 117,120 cy to be excavated, hauled, stockpiled, and compacted 16. Each intake requires 442,470 cy to be imported and compacted 17. Dredging on river bank and in river channel at each cofferedam 18. Pipeline/tunnel Alignment: 4,000 tons. 19. An additional 30% of tunnel muck material is expected due to larger outside diameter tunnel (44 ft) under Alt 4. 20. Tunnel boring, four pipes (12 ft diameter) from intakes to forebay and forebay to PC tunnel, from cofferdam area under levee, potential 63,000 cy of excavation and 55,000 cy of bedding/backfill 21. Intake cast-in-place concrete: 22,090 cy concrete; 1,700 kips of reinforcing bar 22. Import 2,800 cy riprap place around cofferdam 23. Import and compact 400,000 cy fill for new levees 24. Tunnel conveyance excavation and backfill material: excavate and haul to stockpile 591,397 cy; export much 23.5 million cy (under Alt 4 tunnel muck will increase by approx	1. All existing vegetation and trees would be cleared and grubbed along the pipeline easement and disposed of offsite. (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-64) 2. Intakes: Detour roads needed for all intakes, for traffic circulation around the work areas. It is expected that earthen ramps would be required to realign the roadways from levee crown to landside ground elevation. There will only be 3 intakes constructed under the preferred alternative. 971,000 cy is incorrect for Alternative 4A. 3. Correct. 4. Correct (with the exception of cofferdams installed for fish gates). 5. Cubic yards of material for each intake location on page 3C-3 of the Final EIR/EIS. 6. Correct. 7. Each intake site would require a temporary cofferdam to create a dewatered construction area encompassing the entire intake site. 8. Correct. 9. Sheet piles would be driven from within the river by cranes mounted on barges and temporary decks. Refer to Table 3C-2 of the Final EIR/EIS for assumptions used to evaluate impacts from pile driving. 10. Refer to Table 3C-2 of the Final EIR/EIS for assumptions used to evaluate impacts from pile driving. 11. Refer to Table 3C-2 of the Final EIR/EIS for assumptions used to evaluate impacts from pile driving. 12. Refer to Table 3C-2 of the Final EIR/EIS for assumptions used to evaluate impacts from pile driving. 13. Correct. 14. Correct. 15. Please see page 3C-64 of the Final EIR/EIS for excavation quantities for Alternative 4A 16. Total Alternative 4 and 4A excavate, direct haul, and compact: 3,940,000 cy (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-64). 17. Correct. 18. Unclear comment. 19. The estimated volume of RTM to be disposed from tunneling operations is approximately 31,000,000 cy. (Final EIR/EIS pg. 3C-76). 20. Please see page 3C-64 of the Final EIR/EIS for excavation quantities for Alternative

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
		41%, but additional muck storage footprints not anticipated); import and compact 6.1 million cy.	4A. 21. Correct. 22. Correct. 23. Correct. 24. Please see page 3C-64 of the Final EIR/EIS for excavation quantities for Alternative 4A. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 4	Powerpoint used in Part 1 hearing: Overview of Waterfix	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-101 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 5	Powerpoint used in Part 1 hearing: Tunnel/Engineering	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-102 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 6	Powerpoint used in Part 1 hearing: Operations-Impacts	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-103 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 7	Powerpoint used in Part 1 hearing: Modeling	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-104 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 8	Policy statement on behalf of Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-105 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 9	Powerpoint of SHR and North Delta photos	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-106 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 10	Opening statement for Case in Chief	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-107 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 11	Case in Chief for Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-108 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 12	Statement of qualifications witness Nicole S. Suard	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-109 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 13	Copy of Protest form filed	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-110 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 14	SHR History and photo summary & "Best Small Park 2001", and permits. Delta Recreation maps	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-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.

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 15	1960 DWR Water Bulletin No. 76 "Delta Water Facilities"	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 16	1908 description of flows on SS and Sac in dry year-highlighted	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 17	1908 Full Description to accompany Survey of the Sacramento River submitted to US House of Representatives: Letter from the Secretary of War. Plus maps	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-6f 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 18	1908 Survey showing lower Steamboat Slough	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-6-1 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 19	1908 Survey showing lower Steamboat Slough	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-6-2 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 20	1908 Survey showing upper section of Steamboat Slough	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-6-3 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.

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 21	1908 Survey showing area of Walnut Gove	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-6-4 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 22	1908 Survey showing area of Courtland	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-6-5 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 23	1908 Survey showing area of Clarksburg	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-6-6 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 24	1908 Survey showing area of Isleton	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-6-7 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 25	2013 Water Portfolio Inflow Outflow Delta (screen print) larger size	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 26	SHR-7 detail includes pie charts showing graphically the unaccounted	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-7large 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 27	for flow data	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-7poster 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 28	2010 Historical Fresh Water and Salinity Conditions in the Western Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and Suisun Bay. Graph showing history of diversions, exports and storage from page 5	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 29	Conclusion statement of SHR-9	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-9b 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 30	1935 Soils Map of the Sacramento San Joaquin Delta Area, Henry G. Knight, Chief, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Bureau of Chemistry and Soils	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 31	Data gaps: study on CDEC missing data by N. Suard 4-8-2014	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-11 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 32	Data gaps: study on CDEC accuracy poster format and flow chart from CDEC screen prints	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-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.

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 33	Resolution No 68-16 SWRCB Statement of Policy with Respect to Maintaining High Quality of Waters in California	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 34	Map of Delta area water rights (screenprint from Waterboards site)	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 35	1911 Map of Drinking Water wells in the upper Central Valley USGS survey of Water Supply, Plate 5	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-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.

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 36	Slide set of water quality issues in the North Delta with photos by NSS	This attachment Is Exhibit SHR-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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 37	Slides for arsenic in groundwater questions-modeling	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 38	Drinking water and salinity	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-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.

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 39	Chart of minimum flows with Tunnels operating: Information not provided by DWR	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 40	Information on flow data gaps for march 2014, sent to USACE	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-23b 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 41	Graphic of aquifer recharge (screen print from BDCP docs)	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-24 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 42	2004 Public Health Goals for Chemicals in Drinking Water: Arsenic	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 43	USGS Analysis on the Occurrence of Arsenic in Groudwater 2000	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 44	SWRCB, Division of Water Quality Gama program: Arsenic	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 45	2005 Delta Region Drinking Water Quality Management Plan	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-28 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 46	Anti-degredation policy	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 47	Anti-degredation policy, highlighted text	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-29h 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 48	Screen print, current SWRCB flow requirements-SWRCB Resolution No. 2010-0039	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-31 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 49	SWRCB full document, pages 2, 38-map, 112, 113	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-31f 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 50	Over-allocation of flows from the Sacramento River-screen print	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-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.

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 51	"100 Years of California's Water Rights System: Patterns, trends and uncertainty." Theodore E. Grantham and Joshua H Viers, Center for Watershed Sciences, University of California, Davis Page 6	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 52	2005 USGS Study of Arsenic in drinking water in the Central Valley, P 27	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-34 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 53	Full 2005 USGS Study	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-34f 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 54	2011 USGS Study of Arsenic in drinking water in the Central Valle, P 38	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-35 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 55	Full 2011 USGS Study	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-35f 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 56	DSM2 hydrology and bathymetry data timeline and with addition of missing subsurface flow diversion structures	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-39e 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 57	WF map of DSM2 grid	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-39wf 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 58	WF map of DSM2 with elevation and bathymetry updated 2016	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-39wf2 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 59	Bathymetry development presentation slides by Aron Blake, USGS	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-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.

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 60	"Garbage in, garbage out" 2007	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-40f 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 61	Links to barriers planning-pdf of webpage at snugharbor.net timeline	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 62	Map of Bench Studies on Steamboat Slough under BDCP/CalFed	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-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.

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 63	2016 DSM2 Bathymetry update slide	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-43 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 64	Tidal and River Datums in the Sacramento River (map)	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-50 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 65	USBR 2008 Delta Passage Model Map	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-63 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 66	Appendix 9J-Full document Delta Passage Model	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-64 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 67	USBR Delta Passage Model flow and acres chart	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 68	Yolo Bypass Salmonid Habitat Restoration Implementation Plan 1,21,45	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-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.

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 69	Salmon extinction chart by USBR-NOAA	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-67 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 70	Salmon extinction chart by USBR-NOAA	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-67b 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 71	2500 cfs Red Bluff Diversion news article	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-68 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 72	"What caused the Sacramento River fall Chinook stock collapse?" 2009	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 73	Timeline and history of uses of property at Snug Harbor	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-75 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 74	Statement of Permits and water rights & use	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-76 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 75	Graph of drinking water quality decline-SHR example	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-77 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 76	Steamboat Slough History	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-78 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 77	Ryer Island statement of points of diversion-riparian	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-79 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 78	CALFED timeline & Water Exports	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-80 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 79	Location in NorCal-map	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-81 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 80	Well and water quality data for SHR (example of incorrect SWRCB data	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-82 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 81	Screen print of GeoTrackerGama map of Public Water Systems in Bay and Delta area	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-83 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 82	Bottleneck on Steamboat Slough and channel benck impacts	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-84 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 83	1908 Survey of the Sacramento River (Including Steamboat Slough) Hogsback Shoals section	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-200 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 84	List of links for History of Steamboat Slough and salmon migration	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-203 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 85	Travel to Sacramento via Delta Waterways: Steamboat Slough focus Video: http://snugharbor.net/old_sacramento_river-video.html	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-204 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 86	Hall irrigation map of the Delta	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-205 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 87	1982 Geologic Maps of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta by Brian F Atwater "Courtland" (Upper Steamboat, Sutter Slough)	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-206a 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 88	1982 Geologic Maps of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta by Brian F. Atwater "Isleton" (Steamboat Slough by Snug Harbor) Notations added	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-206b 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 89	1982 Geologic Maps of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta by Brian F. Atwater "Rio Vista" (Steamboat Slough and Sacramento River Confluence	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-206c 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 90	Scanned pages from 2935 "Paddle Wheel Days in California" by Jerry MacMullen	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-208 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 91	1873 Board of Commissioners on Irrigation, Map of the San Joaquin,Sacramento and Tulare Valleys	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-209 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 92	1895 Steamboat Slough map showing Hogsback and "Chraleston" Island (portion of map, locates shipwreck of the Charleston)	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-210 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 93	1945 Central Valley Basin Water Resources Development-USBR	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-211 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 94	Excerpts: 1862 view of Steamboat Slough and Sacramento River by	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-212 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 95	James M. Hutchings, and enlargement of one graphic from the book	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-212a 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 96	Excerpts regarding travel on Steamboat Slough in the 1850s to 1900 by Jerry MacMullen, "1935 Paddle Wheel Days in California" highlighted	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-213 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 97	1848 to 1900 Shipwrecks on Steamboat Slough of the Sacramento Delta Region: Summary from 1986 State Lands Commission study of historic shipwrecks in the North Delta Region Water Resources, Report to the Legislature of 1931	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-214 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 98	1930 State Water Plan, Bulletin No. 25, Publications of the Division of Water Resources, Report to the Legislature of 1931	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-215 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 99	Historical Timeline and links published 2012 for reference by N. Suad	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-216 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 100	The Settlement Geography of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta by John Thompson, December 1957	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-217 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 101	1854 Sacramento River map, Henry Lange author (section of map) Full map at David Rumsey.com	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-218 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 102	1923 Steamboat Captain's map of the Sacramento River Delta landings (section of 60" long map)	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-220 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 103	1850 map by Commander Ringgold showing navigation on Sacramento River and its forks-note the names used in 1850	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-221 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 104	Excerpts from James M. Hutchings 1862 book "Scenes of Wonder and Curiosity", reference quantity of salmon on the Sacramento River	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-222 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 105	1975 Bulliten No 192 "Plan for Improvement of Delta Levees" (excerpt of)	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-223 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 106	2014 notice of lawsuit filed related to rice growing and arsenic	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-250 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 107	State of California Drinking Water State Revolving Fund	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-251 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 108	Map of Stimulated Wells, FrackTracker	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-252 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 109	2014 low tide photos of impacts	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-253 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 110	MWD So. California's Integrated Water Resources Plan 1996, P 1,15	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-254 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 111	Surplus Water Graphic	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-255 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 112	2007 BDCP Conservation Strategy (notation for Steamboat Slough)	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-256 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 113	OCAP Chapter 1, 2008 Summary of Legal Rights	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-258 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 114	2011 CALFED Update-funding	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-259 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 115	Timeline of Actions Affecting Water Quality	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-319 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 116	DWR chart provided via email on 8-25-16, received 8-26-16	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-350 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 117	NSS statement of receipt of DWR chart	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-351 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 118	DWR chart provided via email on 8-26-16	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-352 presented for 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 119	not uploaded: DWR-SHR email series regarding DWR chart	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-353 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 120	Critical Year comparison	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-381 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 121	A&E requirement and screen print	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-385 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 122	Water Code Part 1.5 re: 5-year reporting requirement: Delta outflows	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-386 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 123	A&E Delta Outflow from 8-29-16	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-388 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 124	Steamboat slough data gap 2016	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-389 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 125	errate of 389	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-389 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 126	Study of water missing flows: "Where did the water go? By N. Suard	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-390e 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 127	Mapped New Intakes affecting Delta flows (poster format) by N. Saurd	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-391 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 128	2007 Delta Water Quality study-CALFED Bay-Delta program	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-392 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 129	2005 Delta Water Quality plan-Solano (duplicate)	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-393 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 130	Historical diversions to 2005-screen print	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-394 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 131	BDCP Key Decision/Products Schedule 1-4 2010	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-395 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 132	BDCP-CALFED 10 year Action Plan 2006	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-396 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 133	CALFED Bay-Delta Program Year 8 Funding, page 4	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-397 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 134	USBR-Increase in exports 2010	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-398 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 135	2013 California Water Plan Update, screen prints review	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-400 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 136	2014-2015 treatment study-not uploaded?	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-402 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 137	1911 well map-duplicate	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-403 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 138	Yolo Bypass restoration map	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-404 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 139	2007 Bathymetry map-DWR	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-405 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 140	Dayflow 2014 data	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-406 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
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 141	Statement of Verification of Docments uploaded by N. Suard	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-500 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 142	SHR list of Exhibits	This attachment is Exhibit SHR-501 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 143	Yolo Bypass restoration map	This attachment 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.

Letter	Comment #	Comment	Relation to Final EIR/EIS
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 144	2007 Bathymetry map-DWR	This attachment 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 145	Dayflow 2014 data	This attachment 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 146	Statement of Verification of Documents uploaded by N. Suard	This attachment 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.
Snug Harbor Resorts, LLC	ATT 147	SHR list of Exhibits	This attachment 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.