

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1100	1	<p>Screw the big Ag and especially the [expletive deleted] frackers. They should be shot probably, and put out of humanity's misery. You are probably stupid enough to support this crap load because someone is kicking back to you. Intelligence says it is a pretty stupid idea. So, non-intelligent reasons are the only motive to support this.</p> <p>And I literally would feel somewhat relieved if people started blowing up fracking rigs before they drilled and destroyed the aquifers.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water timing to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Providing regulatory oversight to oil companies or large agribusiness is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34(Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>
1101	1	<p>Have the Koch brother's machine made you daffy, Mr. Governor?</p> <p>Separate the wheat from the chaff. We know that agriculture is Important to California economy, but you are being courted by big business and not the people. Again we are being laid out to dry...literally, due to the corporate stranglehold on our state and national government.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The commenter is thanked for their comment. The BDCP/California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry.</p>
1101	2	<p>Observe that the citizens of Santa Barbara rejected the proposed tunnels. Sounds like justification for fracking to me. Once you build tunnels, the lobbyists will say that you dug tunnels for water, why not water. Stupid idea and you know it.</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. For more information regarding purpose and need and beneficial use of water please see Master Response 3 and 34.</p>
1101	3	<p>Leave our natural waterways (what is left of them) systems. Develop water to the wasteful farmers. We should not be growing rice here. Take that off the list of foods we need. It is basically a processed food and used for process foods.</p> <p>Corporations, my friend are not people ... we are the people. Corporations do not pay their fair tax. We are subsidizing the agribusiness and not the small independent farmer. Do you not get it?</p>	<p>The commenter is thanked for their comment. The BDCP/California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry.</p> <p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via BDCP proposed conveyance facilities.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via BDCP proposed conveyance facilities.</p>
1101	4	<p>The citizens are required to reduce their use of water. Hello? I have lived in California all my life and I was taught about conservation by my quaint stepfather, who practiced water saving before it was a trend.</p> <p>Those who live here have to sacrifice. I believe no lawns is a starter. Good for local business. I have always conserved but I will be punished with higher rates, as the meter is not paying attention. I know, tell people to water wisely and get rid of their lawns.</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Although components such as desalination plants and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. It is important to note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		I am so tired of this corporate harassment!	
1102	1	Hey ... It is hard enough for us homeowners to deal with the drought. Do not swipe an entire river to give to agribusiness and big oil! We need a break. Dump the tunnel idea!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS documentation. Regulating large agribusinesses and oil companies is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. The commenter is referred to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
1103	1	I would expect you to protect the ecology and the economy of California, for citizens, not corporations. We are already in a severe drought, and this proposal would not help the most vulnerable small farmers or taxpayer.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Appendix 3A of the Draft EIR/EIS describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered. Appendix 1B describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. The project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole and not as a result of corporations. The issue of corporations is beyond the scope of the proposed project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. Refer to RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, Impact AG-1 and Impact AG-2 and their associated mitigation for a complete analysis of how the project will affect Delta farmland that in turn would be of concern to affected farmers. An analysis of economic impacts, including impacts related to agriculture, recreation, water rates, and taxes are evaluated in the Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report as online at: http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/Draft_BDCP_Statewide_Economic_Impact_Report_8-5-13.sflb.ashx. The environmental documentation and project approval will be acted on by the decision makers from each lead agency at the conclusion of the CEQA and NEPA processes.</p>
1103	2	I am concerned that the diverted water would be used for harmful fracking operations.	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water timing to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Providing regulatory oversight to oil companies or large agribusiness is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34(Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>
1104	1	Oil companies want to use it for fracking. Our water supply is too low to start this kind of a project.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water timing to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Providing regulatory oversight to oil companies or large agribusiness is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34(Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>
1105	1	Fracking for profit and not for the health of the planet is not wise and is un-necessary. We need to tend to water and energy needs here at home.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1106	1	Redirecting a river and robbing the entire state of precious water resources for the enrichment of oil companies to increase fracking, and the disastrous consequences that include more earthquakes and poisoned water, is an insult to our taxpayers.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water timing to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Providing regulatory oversight to oil companies or large agribusiness is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34(Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>
1106	2	Allowing certain large agricultural firms to enrich themselves while robbing taxpayers and small farmers of the water they need is criminal.	<p>The commenter is thanked for their comment. The BDCP/California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via BDCP proposed conveyance facilities and Master Response 26 for additional discussion regarding exports and water rights.</p>
1107	1	The north cannot keep propping up the south. For eons, people have migrated to better resources. It is common sense.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S documentation.</p>
1107	2	Desalinate the sea water.	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Please see Master Response 7, which describes why an alternative focused on desalination is not included in the EIR/EIS. Desalination is one strategy used in California to develop new supplies, yet it is not the primary solution for the State's water shortage due to many factors, including limited capacity and technology, high costs and energy demands, and regulatory uncertainty.
1108	1	Our water table is lower than ever before and people need water to survive. The people of California are doing our best to cut back on our water usage by taking fewer showers, allowing our gardens to be less than abundant and making sure we stay conscious of every drop of water we use. Now big agriculture wants to take all of our water and waste it more and more on unsustainable practices growing mono crops which are not good for the earth or our water supply. Plus the oil and gas companies want to waste billions of gallons on hydraulic fracking which all of us know is wrong, wasteful and is killing communities all over the country.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water timing to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Providing regulatory oversight to oil companies or large agribusiness is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 6 (Demand Management), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>
1108	2	You used to be a liberal person who was for the people and now you, as many politicians before you are being bought by big money, big corporations and big agribusiness. This is not the Jerry Brown I remember from the 70's. Please go back to your roots of being for the common person in this state and say no to this project, hydraulic fracking and other wasteful water killing plans and give our state and the people who live here sustainable practices so we can continue to thrive.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
1109	1	<p>Water is the new gold of the 21st century. I have lived through two previous droughts in CA. Only the northern portion of the state had to ration; Southern California just kept watering their driveways.</p> <p>Water should not be wasted. It should be metered and rationed throughout the state. Not just the northern portion because all of our water is shipped south to water driveways and artificial lawns.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The action alternatives could only change the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS. The CVP and SWP water users are required to implement water meters by their specific contracts.</p>
1110	1	Water policy should take into consideration all Californians' needs as well as protecting the environment!	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1111	1	No new ways to use and waste water. Conservation is demanded.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the Draft EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, Draft EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. The commenter is also referred to the following Master Responses: Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 4 (Alternatives Development), Master Response 6 (Desalination/ Demand Management), Master Response 7 (Desalination), and Master Response 37 (Storage).</p>
1112	1	<p>I live in eastern Madera County and drive through Highway 99 communities on a weekly basis. Last winter, during what was obviously a serious drought year, hundreds of acres between Chowchilla and Merced were planted in new almond orchards. Some of the trees appear to be planted too close together to be practical, and I assumed they were grapes or pomegranates until the leaves came out. I feel little sympathy for any growers who are contributing to the water crisis by planting under these conditions.</p> <p>I feel no sympathy for the big water companies whose angry signs can be seen all over the Central Valley. They are trying to guilt-trip the state into funding orchards in what is virtually a desert environment and has never supported non-irrigated agriculture.</p> <p>Neither does the valley need more housing or other high water use projects.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via BDCP proposed conveyance facilities.</p> <p>The proposed project does not propose any changes to existing housing in the Plan Area.</p>
1112	2	<p>We have limited water resources in this state and those resources are already stretched too thin to be supportable.</p> <p>California can look into desalinization and other water reclamation possibilities to provide for cities, agriculture, fishing and recreational business without continuing to destroy the Delta and drain the rivers of what little we have.</p>	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>See Master Response 7 for a more detailed discussion of various desalination projects under consideration and in development at this time. For more information regarding CALSIM II modeling please see Appendix 5A of the FEIR/EIS.</p>
1113	1	<p>I think the taxpayer money for any water project would be better spent on upgrading other existing systems having specific requirements within the allocations portion of the law for increasing earthquake resistance of the major supply water systems to municipal water districts that supply mostly to residential area systems because one big earthquake has the probability to simultaneously leave many residential systems crippled or totally unusable and they would have to be repaired to supply water to the large population centers of California.</p> <p>Along with that, for the major water supply systems to those critical municipal systems there should at least be a supply of useable repair parts that will actually fit and be ready to use on short notice that are strategically located throughout the State and also an able readied workforce strategy having allocated and accessible equipment available for the emergency water supply repairs to be done in a rapid response condition.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The effects of an earthquake on the water conveyance features specific to each alternative during construction are described in Chapter 9, Impact GEO-1 in Sections 9.3.3.2, 9.3.3.3, 9.3.3.4, 9.3.3.5, 9.3.3.6, 9.3.3.7, 9.3.3.8, 9.3.3.9, 9.3.3.10, 9.3.3.11, 9.3.3.12, 9.3.3.13, 9.3.3.14, 9.3.3.15, and 9.3.3.16.</p> <p>As described in Master Response 20 and Section 3E.2.6.2 of Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, major seismic events could result in reduced or total cessation of SWP and CVP water deliveries to areas located to the south of the Delta for 2 to more than 6 years for repairs; and for some time after the repairs. These conditions could occur with equal frequency under the</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		I know that if there is already a system like what I mentioned above I think it reasonable to say that it is both out of date and inadequate and therefore should be modified or renewed entirely and then be supported enough so that it is a robust system.	Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, or any of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS. However, climate change could lead to a higher probability of levee failure in the future than under Existing Conditions. Methods for water users to respond to loss of SWP and CVP water supplies also would be similar under the No Action Alternative and all of the other alternatives considered in the EIR/EIS. However, those methods are not considered under the Purpose and Need of the action alternatives; and are not evaluated in the EIR/EIS. It is assumed under the No Action Alternative and all of the EIR/EIS alternatives that SWP and CVP facilities would continue to be maintained.
1113	2	There cannot be enough protections for the environment, or non-agricultural stakeholders put into the law that could not be undone by powerful and moneyed interests who do not care about anything other than their own extractive ways of making the highest profit which is not necessarily bad but when it is at a cost of taxpayers and the environment, who shoulder the large majority of the burdens that go along with it now and in the future? I think the taxpayers' money would be better spent on something else other than the tunnel project.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
1114	1	When it comes to the health of people and the environment, money is not a tradeoff.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The commenter is referred to the following Master Responses: 3 (Purpose and Need) and 4 (Alternatives Development), along with Chapter 25 (Public Health) of the Draft EIR/EIS and Appendix A (Chapter 25) of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Effects of the proposed water conveyance and associated restoration activities on general resource areas are discussed in Ch. 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Where impacts are determined to be significant, mitigation and/or environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible.
1115	1	While I was born and raised in the Bay area, I have lived the last 30-plus years in Bakersfield and am very familiar with agriculture in the valley. The west side was always lacking water and it was not the brightest idea to plant crops that are water intensive. Although I have compassion for the small farmers' plight, I do not have that same feeling for large agribusinesses and oil corporations.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The commenter is thanked for their comment. The BDCP/California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry.
1115	2	I believe that these tunnels will seriously erode the fragile ecosystem of the Delta and are unwise. California needs so many things (improved roads, a bullet train, better public transportation, schools, improvement of the bridges and the repair of the Lake Isabella Dam), what we do not need are these tunnels.	The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. The project would allow the federal and state water projects to deliver water supplies reliably in a way less harmful to fish. The plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. For other points raised by the commenter, refer to the following Master Responses: Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 5 (Conservation Measure 1 as a CM, Overview of Restoration and Enhancement Activities), and Master Response 4 (Tunnel Alternative). Also, refer to the Draft EIR/EIS (Chapters 11 and 12), as well as RDEIR/SEIS including Sections 4, 5, and

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Appendix A (e.g., Chapter 11 [Fish and Aquatic Resources] and Chapter 12 [Terrestrial Biological Resources]).
1116	1	How many times do we have to say no way? Much of the water will go to fracking, rendering the water useless for all time. Water for life is a necessity, not a luxury item. We have said no to the twin tunnels and to fracking. No manipulation or suppression of the facts will change our stance. This our state and our country. This our future and the future of our families and friends. No!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water timing to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Providing regulatory oversight to oil companies or large agribusiness is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34(Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>
1117	1	<p>Big agriculture in California already gets 80% of the water and wastes much of that. Require big agriculture to quit flooding fields and using sprinklers to irrigate, have them convert to drip systems and see how much water they save.</p> <p>Please remove your support of the twin tunnel project. It will ruin Northern California to support the biggest water wasters in our state!</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The action alternatives could only change the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS.</p> <p>It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).</p>
1118	1	Stop letting bottled water companies deplete our water reserves and sell the water out of state for huge profit.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS were raised.</p>
1118	2	Fracking will come back to haunt us by contaminating the land on which we grow our food. If we cannot find safe, long-term solutions to problems that arise (like nuclear waste) in the name of progress and profit, then maybe we should slow down the need to progress. A perfect example of irresponsible government is how the cell phone companies lobbying efforts delayed no cell phone use while driving for so long.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		In the present climate, profit always trumps common sense.	
1119	1	Redirecting a portion of the river will disrupt the ecosystem in the area; moving the habitat of hundreds of species of plants and animals is not worth the damage when there are obviously simpler and more feasible solutions.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state ESAs, and as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Resource areas are addressed in both the Draft EIR/EIS and in the RDEIR/SDEIS (see Appendix A) concerning the San Joaquin Valley and Sacramento River, including but not limited to surface water (Chapter 6), water quality (Chapter 8), fish and aquatic resources (Chapter 11), and terrestrial biological resources (Chapter 12). Where impacts are found to be significant, mitigation and/or environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible. Appendix 1B of the Draft EIR/EIS describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination.</p>
1120	1	I side with evolutionary processes. A sane water system used to exist before Euro-Americans showed up. It provided abundant habitat for billions of life forms, and fed a human population matched to the land's carrying capacity. I would rather live with a lot fewer humans and a lot more salmon. Take down the dams and get your [expletive deleted] engineering out of our lands and waterways.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S documentation.</p>
1121	1	<p>It is time to move forward into the reality of our world. Water, that most precious commodity, cannot be given to big business. The threat of its use in fracking is untenable and unacceptable. The environment must be protected, maintained, and respected, even as the health of the state's population is considered.</p> <p>Striking the balance is key. We cannot tilt the balance in favor of corporations, lest we threaten the lives of all.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water timing to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Providing regulatory oversight to oil companies or large agribusiness is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34(Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>
1122	1	It is disgusting that California would even consider polluting its precious and diminishing fresh water for fracking.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
1122	2	<p>Several animals are already at risk of dying due to the dismissed water supply.</p> <p>Have some respect for nature and your constituents, do not approve this tunnel project.</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>
1123	1	<p>This project seems poorly thought out. It is insanely expensive and it seems that eventually the only way to cover the costs will be for farmers to sell the water to oil companies and urban residents. In addition, the project will lower water tables and cause serious saltwater intrusions.</p> <p>I agree that the current system is unsustainable but we need to go back to the drawing board and craft a thoughtful, well-considered plan that will actually create a long-term sustainable water system. Any new water project should not create subsidized water such that large agricultural interests and the oil industry can increase their water use. We need to focus on reducing water use and creating an ecologically and economically sustainable system, not a system that will promote expansion, promote more water use, cost taxpayers huge amounts in the event of default by the bondholders, etc. This project simply is not the right fit.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project is costly, but proponents have assessed the benefits as described in the funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those facilities. Expenditures of public money from other sources would be limited to restoration activities beyond those needed to mitigate the impacts of facility construction. 2013 Public Draft Chapter 8, which deals with cost issues, and cost-benefit analysis information are available on the BDCP website. Please see Master response 5 for more information on project costs and funding.</p> <p>The proposed project does not make determinations regarding how water conveyed through the proposed project, California Aqueduct, Delta Mendota Canal, or other water conveyance facilities is put to a beneficial use. Contractors and their customers must make economic decisions about planting in light of the amounts of water they are likely to receive going forward.</p> <p>Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3. For more information regarding salinity please see Master Response 14 and Chapter 8 of the FEIR/EIS.</p>
1124	1	<p>Existing projects that bring water to Central and Southern California use excessive energy and therefore cause global warming. We need to reduce consumption, not increase water transfer. Farms and residences alike need to follow water conservation methods.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1125	1	<p>These proposed tunnels will destroy fisheries, ruin the entire Sacramento Delta, kill the Mc Cloud river area that Native Americans need to survive, cost billions which we cannot afford, and will not solve California's water shortages. The water diversion only benefits the oil industry and desert agri-business. Fracking water is being poisoned and causing earthquakes, and adding to climate change problems.</p> <p>The people who live along the Sacramento River will be ruined and they oppose this horrible</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. DWR's</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		project as well as environmentalist, fishermen and Northern California farmers.	<p>fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water timing to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Providing regulatory oversight to oil companies or large agribusiness is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p> <p>Operations of the new conveyance facilities would not result in any major changes above Shasta reservoir (BDCP Ch 5 Effects Analysis).</p>
1126	1	No fracking and no tunnels!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1127	1	These tunnels are tantamount to selling out this part of the state for the southern part that is overbuilt and wanting too much water. This is a terrible idea for the land and for you as Governor.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS documentation. The commenter is referred to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need). The project would stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be about the same as than the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. The project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole.</p>
1128	1	<p>Why do we want to provide large green pastures for the rich to play golf while we condemn entire species of fish to extinction?</p> <p>Let us not send more water and money south. Let us take care of the north state first.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34(Beneficial Use of</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Water), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).
1129	1	I am concerned that private corporations will reap benefits at taxpayers' expense. Surely they must foot the bill for what benefits them!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1130	1	<p>I would like to speak as an earth science professional. I am California Professional Geologist #8787, and Qualified Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan Developer #20608. I have years of experience in private industry with groundwater and surface water.</p> <p>It makes no sense either economically or scientifically to keep diverting waters of the state - a public resource - to private industries, namely agriculture, to continue to grow crops such as almonds, pistachios, and alfalfa, in a desert. These businesses should be encouraged to switch to crops which present less of a burden on public resources. Yes, the weather is mild year-round in California, but that does not mean it is Florida. Florida is subtropical. The Central Valley is arid and semi-arid. The people of California - and their elected officials - have somehow got to realize that we cannot continue to grow whatever we want here.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The action alternatives could only change the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS.</p> <p>It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).</p>
1131	1	<p>The idea of a huge water give-away to Westside Southern San Joaquin Valley corporate agriculture and water-intensive, water-wasteful big oil frackers, simply infuriates me. We are facing the collapse of our native salmon, steelhead and trout fisheries with creeks and streams already going dry, and the San Joaquin River is practically a stagnant, shallow ditch already...and summer just started today. It is a known fact that historically, California goes through severe droughts, some lasting 400 to 500 years! Yet we build a huge, cancerous megalopolis in the desert that continues to grow as water supplies shrink. People come first when it comes to water, not businesses, and after that, fish and wildlife come second.</p> <p>We cannot continue to feed this cancerous desert dwelling and farming and not expect it to kill the body of California, and the precious salmon with it.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole and not as a result of oil corporations or large agribusinesses. The issue of corporations is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. Effects of the water conveyance and associated restoration activities on general resource areas are discussed in Section 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Where impacts are determined to be significant, mitigation and/or environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible. Appendix 3A of the Draft EIR/EIS describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered. Appendix 1B describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. The environmental documentation and project approval will be acted on by the decision makers from each lead agency at the conclusion of the CEQA and NEPA processes.</p>
1131	2	To plan to build a huge water infrastructure that may be useless in the near future, at huge taxpayer expense, just to benefit desert farming by big agribusiness and big oil is the most outrageous water-redistribution proposal ever designed by mankind. Most Californians strongly oppose it, and we certainly do not want to pay for it.	The proposed project is costly, but the lead agencies have assessed the benefits as described in the BDCP funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those facilities. Expenditures of public money from other sources would be limited to restoration activities beyond those needed to mitigate the impacts of facility construction. BDCP Chapter 8, which deals

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			with cost issues, and cost-benefit analysis information are available on the BDCP website. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on project costs and funding.
1132	1	Farmers and golf courses should not come before fishermen. Save water for salmon and other fish.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole and not as a result of large agribusinesses and golf courses. In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. The commenter is referred to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
1133	1	80% of our water goes to agriculture ... much of it non-food crops. This does not make any sense. There needs to be a change in policy regarding this.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The commenter is thanked for their comment. The BDCP/California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. The proposed project does not propose any changes to existing agricultural practices or related policies.</p> <p>The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via BDCP proposed conveyance facilities.</p> <p>Through the Legislature and through executive agencies, California has embraced water conservation on numerous fronts, as have many California water agencies. Many of these efforts are highlighted in Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, which describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply, including recycled water. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p>
1134	1	I believe that the Central Valley should transition to more sustainable crops, ones that require less water. As for fracking, I think it should be opposed for many reasons, but water use is one of the biggest.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1135	1	Governor Brown, I think you have done a fine job up until this point, but I will not condone this poisonous and water-hoarding fracking endeavor. Nor should you! We are in a historic drought. I am totally against fracking of any kind in our state, and quite frankly, if you continue to pursue this stupidity, I and hundreds of thousands of others will not vote for your re-election. I am not willing to give our water to oil companies so they can poison our groundwater and soil with their fracking chemicals.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		I am dismayed that you think that is ok. It is not ok.	improving water timing to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Providing regulatory oversight to oil companies or large agribusiness is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).
1136	1	We are in a drought. We do not need to make it worse. Tell the money people to tighten their belts and leave our water alone.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The action alternatives could only change the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS.</p> <p>It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).</p>
1137	1	California already exports more water to China as almonds and alfalfa than all California's cities combined use. We do not need to provide any more water at public expense for private profit.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 26 and 3 regarding changes in Delta exports and purpose and need.</p>
1138	1	I am personally most concerned that this water will be redirected to help fracking practices which would not help the economy or the health of Californians. I hope you are not being misled about how this water is to be put to use.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water timing to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 34(Beneficial Use of Water)</p>
1139	1	I have to seriously question your wisdom here, as this only seems to benefit a few, rather than all the people of this state. All the rest of the people would pay for this? Stop messing up our environment, so a few can profit.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>More than two-thirds of the residents of the state and more than two million acres of highly productive farm land receive water exported from the Delta watershed. The proposed project aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way that is more protective of fish than the current system.</p> <p>Information regarding BDCP costs and funding is provided in Chapter 8, Implementation Costs and Funding Sources, BDCP. State Water Project and Central Valley Project contractors would be responsible for funding construction and operation of new water conveyance facilities, as well as the costs for mitigating the impacts associated with facility construction. Remaining costs for implementing the conservation plan would come from a variety of public sources, including federal appropriations, state and federal grants, and the water bond. Please see Master Response 5 for more information regarding costs of implementation and funding for proposed project.</p>
1140	1	<p>Just as you did with the original matter related to the wind industry, which was perhaps a more understandable mistake. You are about to make another devastating mistake if you promote the tunnels. Have you any morality? You cannot claim to be misinformed this time, as you might argue about the wind industry fiasco. Just what kind of cupidity justifies this carnage to California, to say nothing of any sort of legacy you will be proud to leave? Think very carefully.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The statements made by the commenter address the merits of the project and do not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS documentation. Issues related to the wind industry are beyond the scope of the project.</p>
1141	1	<p>I know what it is like to run out of water. I live in the San Francisco North Bay. We grow organic tomatoes here, a thirsty plant. We have had to look for better ways to keep our 5 acres vital and use less water in the process. We have been successful; our well has not gone dry. Unless others conserve water in this way, the impact of a family farm is not going to make a big difference. The solution is not more water via a pipeline but less water to those corporate farms.</p> <p>They need to get on board.</p> <p>We need food.</p> <p>We need to conserve water.</p> <p>That is the bottom line.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The lead agencies do not have any authority to impose mandatory water rationing on a statewide basis. Rather, there are dozens of independent water agencies and city water departments in California that exercise authority over their own service areas. Only these individual agencies have the authority to impose rationing on their customers.</p> <p>Although components such as desalination plants and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. It is important to note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Please refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p>
1142	1	<p>This is totally unnecessary. The Zeonon water system has allowed Orange County to drink its own wastewater. Fill their depleted aquifer and have the cleanest drinking water on the state. The Central Valley has dropped 100 feet in 100 years. All we need to do is to reuse the 85% of California water the farmers get. Let this water percolate into the aquifer and there will be enough water for everyone and we will not need any new tunnels, dams, or Delta work. The valley will rise. Everyone has a well and the water can be used over and over</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		again.	<p>Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p> <p>For more information regarding the development of alternatives and demand management please see Master Response 4 and 6.</p>
1143	1	<p>This proposed project comes at a time when California should be spending time and effort adapting to the realities of climate change. A central reality of climate change for California is that water will only continue to be in shorter and shorter supply. We must adapt to climate change in California by moving away from intensive agriculture in the Central Valley. This project goes in the wrong direction for facing our dwindling water supply. A central reality of climate change in California and globally is that we need to move away from fossil fuels as a source of energy. This project goes in the wrong direction for getting off of fossil fuels.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The EIR/EIS deals properly and thoroughly with issues related to climate change. Please refer to Master Response 19 (Climate Change) and Master Response 31, Compliance with Applicable Delta Reform Act Requirements, Issue 2, Climate Change, for a listing of the numerous chapters and appendices in the EIR/EIS that address and demonstrate the importance of climate change in the evaluation of the proposed project's alternatives.</p> <p>It is important to note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 5 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>In regards to moving away from intensive agriculture, providing regulatory oversight to agribusinesses is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. The Lead Agencies do not have land use planning authorities (such as changing local land uses and zoning ordinances or controlling what crops should be planted). Similarly, reducing global dependence on fossil fuels as a source of energy is also beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>The scope and purpose of the proposed project is much more limited. As explained in Chapter 2 Project Objectives and Purpose and Need of the Final EIR/EIS, the fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the State Water Project (SWP) system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and Central Valley Project (CVP) south-of-Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework with statutory and contractual obligations.</p> <p>The project would help to address the resilience and adaptability of the Delta to climate change through water delivery facilities combined with a range of operational flexibility. In addition to the added water management flexibility created by new water diversions and operational scenarios, the project would improve habitat, increase food supplies and reduce the effects of other stressors on the Delta ecosystem. The new diversions would also help protect critical water supplies against the threats of sea level rise and earthquakes.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1143	2	<p>This proposed project is fiscally irresponsible. If the state cannot afford to fund, for example, better schools and universities that serve everyone in the state, how can the state justify spending taxpayer dollars on the antiquated, impractical, large-scale, special interest industries of unmeted agriculture and oil mining?</p>	<p>Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>The fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <p>Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the BDCP would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p>
1144	1	<p>Why are you going to bleed Northern California dry? Southern California has plenty of money; let them use their money to create desalinization plants instead of depleting Northern California's natural resource.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p> <p>See Master Response 7 for a more detailed discussion of various desalination projects under consideration and in development at this time.</p>
1144	2	<p>Governor Brown, I respectfully ask you to reconsider this move as I believe this plan does not look after the best interests of all of the people of California. Are you sure you want to leave this as your legacy? There are enough people who want to divide this great state of California into separate states because the people of Northern California feel like they do not receive equal representation. This is not about the number of people in each local, but rather the amount of money in each local.</p> <p>Are you being bought and paid for? Please rethink this one.</p>	<p>The statements made by the commenter address the merits of the project and do not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS documentation. Issues related to creating separate states within California and political legacies are beyond the scope of the project.</p>
1145	1	<p>Draining waters from our ecosystems damages the ecosystem and their species of biological diversity, like fish.</p> <p>Science states clearly, we are suicidal when we damage ecosystems. Mankind only breathes because of the planet Earth created, seeded, evolved and planted or ecosystems. All ecosystems are all interlinked and integrated.</p> <p>"In Wildness is the salvation of the Earth and the preservation of all life." [Aldo Leopold]</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The now preferred California WaterFix Project (without the HCP as proposed by the BDCP) would provide secure California water supplies and improve the Delta ecosystem by implementing a 9,000 cfs water</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>diversion point in the north Delta, where its operations would improve water flows. Constructing new water diversion points in the north Delta with state-of-the-art fish screens and providing a means to transport water supplies under the Delta, rather than through sensitive natural channels, would help maintain reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California's population while balancing the needs of the Delta ecosystem. The plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years.</p>
1146	1	<p>I have read about the tunnels -- pro and con. I do not believe that the tunnel approach is the most cost effective approach. I do not want it to go forward. Further, unless we start making oil companies pay for their water use with extractions and fracking why should the taxpayers pay for tunnels? When we start to tax offshore oil I will consider giving more water to oil.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The construction of the water delivery facilities is estimated to cost \$14.9 billion, an amount that would be paid for by the state and federal water contractors who rely on Delta exports. The range of costs for water vary widely among contractors south of the Delta. Costs depend on the source of water, transport facilities, energy requirements, among other factors. For the agricultural customers of the CVP, prices range from \$100 per acre-foot to more than \$400 per acre-foot. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, which buys water from the SWP, estimates that the cost of the proposed project would translate into about \$5.00 extra per household, per month in its service area. The final cost of water from the new conveyance facilities would be determined by numerous factors. A number of these significant factors, such as the project yield and allocation of costs, have yet to be determined. Please see Master Response 5 for information regarding funding of the proposed project. Providing regulatory oversight to oil companies or large agribusiness is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34(Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>
1146	2	<p>I live near agriculture and every day I see huge amounts of water wasted in field sprinklers. We need an integrated and shared total state water and well regulation now and we need to stop the out of date ancient water right agreements that distribute water unjustly and ineffectively for Californians. We are no longer some ignorant population of people where ancient water rights are sacred and a few lucky users get more because they were first. We need to pull together. Throw these old agreements out and start over with a master water plan, and let us be smart users in a global warming economy! Also, we need to have mandatory conservation with penalties.</p> <p>Governor, is this email wasted on deaf ears?</p>	<p>The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff 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. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. The proposed project is one component, among many, of the California Water Action Plan. In its efforts to achieve the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration, the project seeks to protect dozens of species of fish and wildlife in the Delta while also securing reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California. The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change.</p> <p>The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/.</p> <p>Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California’s water resources.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7 regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage. Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project, Master Response 32 regarding water rights, Master Response 26 regarding changes in Delta exports areas of origin and water rights), Master Response 5 regarding Conservation Measure 1 as a CM and Master Response 35 regarding southern California water supply.</p>
1147	1	<p>Much of the water will be going to support the oil and gas industry -- primarily fracking wells are injecting harmful chemicals into the ground, which permeate into the water table. We cannot allow this fracking process to continue wasting our valuable water supply!</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Providing regulatory oversight to oil companies or large agribusiness is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34(Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>
1148	1	<p>We should not be diverting any water to fracking!</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1149	1	<p>I will not have my tax dollars spent on sending precious water to fracking companies so they can waste it and poison our groundwater wells! No way!</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Providing regulatory oversight to oil companies or large agribusiness is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34(Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply). Please see Master Response 5 for information regarding funding of the proposed project.</p>
1150	1	<p>No fracking at all and we need more money put into desalination plants to send water to inland reservoirs adding to the present natural water supply.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Fracking presumably would be an “industrial” use of water. The State Water Resources Control Board has the authority to modify water permits to balance and protect beneficial uses of water. If the Legislature declared fracking to be unreasonable, it would potentially trigger the State Water Resources Control Board to revise water right permits in such a way as to restrict Delta water from being used for fracking.</p> <p>On June 13, 2014 the California Department of Conservation (DOC) released proposed regulations for the use of well stimulation in oil and gas production for a 45-day public comment period. The regulations, which are to go into effect on January 1, 2015, are designed to protect health, safety, and the environment, and supplement existing strong well construction standards. They address a comprehensive list of issues, including testing, monitoring, public notice, and permitting. Through the rule-making process, the state will better understand how much water is actually used for fracking in California. Voluntary reporting indicates that the use of water for fracking is minimal compared to the average diversions from the Delta by the state and federal water projects for farms and cities.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives (such as desalination and water storage) that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that they required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.</p>
1151	1	Why is sending our water south a good idea? They should look into desalinization. Even the aquifer will give out eventually--i.e. sink holes.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p> <p>See Master Response 7 for a more detailed discussion of various desalination projects under consideration and in development at this time. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
1151	2	Until everyone in California has meters on their water, we should not build anything like these tunnels. By metering everyone, we might get enough economy to decrease our water problems statewide. Not sending water south unless they get meters will speed up the process. I hope you have a meter on your house.	<p>Although components such as demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The project cannot impose obligations on third parties that are not applicants under proposed project. Please refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and water conservation.</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
1152	1	This ill-conceived project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars the state cannot afford it and pour precious water down the throats of the fracking industry with its unquenchable appetite for our most precious resource -- water. It must not be done.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The construction of the water delivery facilities is estimated to cost \$14.9 billion, an amount that would be paid for by the state and federal water contractors who rely on Delta exports. The range of costs for water vary widely among contractors south of the Delta. Costs depend on the source of water, transport facilities, energy requirements, among other factors. For the agricultural customers of the CVP, prices range from \$100 per acre-foot to more than \$400 per acre-foot. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, which buys water from the SWP, estimates that the cost of the proposed project would translate into about \$5.00 extra per household, per month in its service area. The final cost of water from the new conveyance facilities would be determined by numerous factors. A number of these significant factors, such as the project yield and allocation of costs, have yet to be determined. Please see Master Response 5 for information regarding funding of the proposed project. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34(Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>
1153	1	Fix the fish screens, and upgrade the existing tunnels.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>DWR and Reclamation are required to improve fish collection efficiency at the existing south Delta salvage facilities, as part of facility improvements required by the NMFS 2009 biological opinion on the SWP/CVP. For example, in 2014, Reclamation replaced the secondary louver system with a traveling screen system. These screens provide protection by guiding fish into the holding tanks while catching debris on pegs and transporting debris to a collection system at the work surface. The technology required at the proposed north Delta intakes and the existing south Delta export facilities differ fundamentally. The north Delta intakes would be located on the side of the river channel and so would be designed to comply with CDFW, NMFS, and USFWS fish screening criteria (BDCP Appendix 5B, Section 3.B.3.3). The south Delta export facilities are located on dead-end channels and require active collection and salvage of fishes. Screening the intakes at Clifton Court Forebay was analyzed during the water conveyance alternative development process and is described in the Draft EIR/EIS, Appendix 3A. This alternative was eliminated from further evaluation because initial results of recent studies, including information included in the recent NMFS biological opinion, supported a phased approach. Such phasing would emphasize improvements to operations of fish handling facilities and reduced predator potential within Clifton Court Forebay, prior to further analysis of installation of fish screens. Nevertheless, DWR and Reclamation will continue investigating strategies to increase fish salvage efficiency, reduce pre-screen losses, and improve screening efficiencies, consistent with the 2009 biological opinion of the SWP/CVP.</p>
1154	1	<p>Governor Brown:</p> <p>I am having to write to you a lot lately, and why that should be is annoying. Water is a human right, and the common good is the only way for any society to function and grow or sustain in a logical and fair way!</p> <p>Big agriculture seems to be acting the bully--again--another tiring issue. You cannot let the corporate people have more benefits than the actual water drinking DNA people! That would be a genocidal murder on a grand scale.</p> <p>Besides, are these corporate people really going to walk off, leave the state, and leave all their trees in the ground? Where are they going to go? Stop pretending that you are the Army Corps of Engineers, because, you know, some of their projects have turned out very</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue of corporate agricultural concerns is beyond the scope of the project. The California Department of Water Resources (DWR) and the US Bureau of Reclamation do not regulate the beneficial uses to which State Water Project or Central Valley Project (CVP) water supplies are put.</p> <p>The proposed project does not make determinations regarding whether water delivered through, the California Aqueduct, Delta Mendota Canal, or other water conveyance facility is put to a beneficial use. The</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		badly (aka Katrina and New Orleans and the wall dikes that fell!	<p>proposed project's conveyance facilities would be operated as a component of the State Water Project (SWP) and would be used to help convey SWP, CVP, and transfer waters to south-of-Delta users. As indicated in the EIR/EIS, the operation of the proposed project includes diverting water through the new north Delta diversion facilities or through the existing south Delta water diversion facilities. In addition, the proposed project would not make determinations regarding what constitutes a beneficial use or modify stipulations in water service contracts between the DWR and the SWP contractors, Reclamation and their contractors, and between water transfer seller and buyer.</p> <p>One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board.</p> <p>For more information on beneficial use, see Master Response 34.</p>
1154	2	With climate change already here, the only way for any state, county, city, town, and community to survive is by sharing! Besides, is not this your last term? You do not get to run again, right? So do the human and environmentally correct thing to do. Water is a human right and a right that we all need to share. The last time people seem to have come together was in WW II. Maybe it is time for people everywhere to share the losses, because by doing that, everyone gets a share--you know, in a democratic republic. We are still that, are we not? If not, then get us back to that, because that is the kind of governing that the climate change, water losing world needs ... now, it needs that now!	The State is addressing climate change through strategies and a decision-making framework as outlined in the California Climate Adaptation Strategy and Adaptation Planning Guide. However, no single project and indeed none of the BDCP alternatives would be able to completely counteract all of the impacts of climate change. More information on ways in which the project proposes to improve resiliency and adaptability of the Delta to climate change can be found in Chapter 29, Climate Change, Draft EIR/EIS and Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, Draft EIR/EIS and for the new sub-alternatives in Section 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Refer also to Master Response 19 (Climate Change and GHG). Additionally, the BDCP process was initiated by former Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, who was twice elected by a majority of California voters. The process has continued under the administration of his successor, Edmund G. Brown, Jr., who has publicly stated his tentative support first for Alternative 4 (BDCP) as set forth in the Draft EIR/EIS and now for Alternative 4A (California WaterFix Project) as described in the RDEIR/SDEIS, though he has acknowledged the need to complete environmental review and to obtain public input prior to making any final decisions on the project. Hence, this planning, design, and environmental process has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole. The environmental documentation and project approval will be acted upon by the decision makers from each lead agency at the conclusion of the CEQA and NEPA processes.
1155	1	<p>The reason corporate agribusinesses are failing is because they are not sustainable in any regard. California agribusiness is exploitative on all levels, ruins aquifers, depletes soils, destroys habitats and ecosystems, poisons neighboring properties, is chemical dependent and carbon energy wasteful.</p> <p>Above are facts, and not opinions.</p> <p>No way will I continue to support multinational corporate grabs of scarce resources without complete overhaul, better oversight, and tighter regulation of the entire agricultural industry.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole and not as a result of large agribusinesses. In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. The commenter is referred to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
1156	1	<p>Similar tunnel projects in places like Santa Barbara County have not been cost effective and have provided little benefit to taxpayers.</p> <p>Not to mention the destruction to the Delta and San Francisco Bay!</p> <p>The only thing more ridiculous and unwarranted than this water project is Jerry Brown's choo-choo train.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S documentation were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state ESAs,</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			and as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
1157	1	How much of this water will be diverted for use by oil and gas exploration for fracking? That is wasting the water twice --- once for the fracking and once by taking it out of usage because it is now polluted and must be stored somehow somewhere! Or do you want to approve an additional bad use by putting it in the ocean to further endanger ocean life?	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water timing to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Providing regulatory oversight to oil companies or large agribusiness is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34(Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>
1157	2	<p>The cost of sending more water, with far too little control over its use, to Southern California, is a significant diversion of building/infrastructure dollars, an ecological nightmare in the Delta and the potential to benefit big agriculture and big gas and corporations, far more than individuals or habitats.</p> <p>Governor Brown, you use to be the forward thinking, earth loving Governor. What happened to that person? Please recall your former self and see that this is a mistake and just repudiate the twin tunnel plan.</p>	<p>The proposed project would allow the federal and state water projects to deliver water supplies reliably in a way less harmful to fish. The plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. For other points raised by the commenter, refer to the following Master Responses: 3 (Purpose and Need), 5 (Conservation Measure 1 as a CM), 47 (Overview of Restoration and Enhancement Activities), 61 (Tunnel Alternative), and 43 (Beneficial Use of Water). For more information on the determination of beneficial use, see Master Response 34.</p>
1158	1	<p>It is time now to stop giving such enormous projects for huge corporations; we taxpayers should not have to fund these in such tight times. If the Governor cannot see fit to fund caretakers for the disabled due to budget concerns, why are we even considering a 67 billion dollar water giveaway to huge corporations? We should not be!</p> <p>We need to stop this tunnel project right now!</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 5 for additional discussion of public benefits and funding.</p>
1158	2	We need to keep our water for Californians. Not fund giant giveaways to fracking oil companies and food exporters! It is time to keep our limited water resources for California's people! Stop the tunnels!	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water timing to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Providing regulatory oversight to oil companies or large agribusiness is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. The project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34(Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1159	1	Some farmers have been working diligently to stop wasting water and reduce unnecessary water use. They are proving it can be done. It is high time for their colleagues to do the same.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The BDCP/California WaterFix project is being proposed to address the conflict between the ecological needs of a range of at-risk Delta species and natural communities, while providing for more reliable water supplies for people, communities, agriculture, and industry. The proposed project does not propose any changes to existing agricultural practices.</p>
1159	2	Fracking in California is absolutely irresponsible and should not happen and no Governor with sense and concern for the future should promote it.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
1160	1	<p>It seems to me that we are going backwards and not forward with regards to water supply sustainability! We do not need more fracking in this state, especially since California has many faults with much seismic activity! Why must we grow unsustainable crops that require enormous amounts of water?</p> <p>The only legislation coming out of Sacramento nowadays is the need for renewable energies and water conservation!</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1161	1	It is hard to imagine a conscientious Governor diverting water to fracking when I cannot even water my backyard garden. Stop the greed and think of us.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>
1162	1	I am particularly concerned that much of this water could be used to facilitate the deadly fracking industry, which uses billions of gallons of water to inject toxic chemicals into the ground.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>
1162	2	I strongly urge you to do the right thing, and reject this proposal.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1163	1	How about building a roof over the length of the aqueduct to prevent water evaporation. If solar panels were put on top of the roof, they would create good energy! These would help the environment ... not big agriculture and oil which the tunnels would only aid.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34. Please refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and water conservation.</p>
1164	1	<p>Your office continues to support bad policies for our state. Fracking and water grabs are just two of the more serious offenses. I am opposed to both of these, and will cast my vote for governor accordingly. I do not know if your opponent will be any better for our environment, but they simply cannot be worse!</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p>
1165	1	<p>Scientists do not speak well of this project according the reports I have read such as the Berkeley Center for Law, Energy, and the Environment Regulation on Hydraulic Fracturing in California, April 2013, and the Pacific Institute's Hydraulic Fracturing and Water Resources: Separating Frack from Fiction, June 2012. There are few rivers left that are not dammed feeding into the Delta which can only survive by more fresh water not less.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water timing to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>
1165	2	<p>There is a drought in California which seems to happen in quick cycles and has become the new normal. Take away the unethical water rights that casinos and corporations have obtained from buying farm land.</p> <p>Enough is enough!</p>	<p>The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. The project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole and not as a result of casinos and corporations. In fact, the issue of corporations is beyond the scope of the proposed project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. For other issues brought up by the commenter, refer to the following Master Responses: 3 (Purpose and Need) and 54 (Water Rights Issues).</p>
1166	1	<p>Many years ago we said no to this water grab. Yet here we are again attempting to ruin the Delta and its surroundings for the sake of greedy corporations. Why ruin a whole state for the sake of a temporary fix because of greed? This water will only encourage further development which will demand yet more water.</p> <p>No, no, a thousand times no.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The BDCP process has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole and not as a result of large corporations. In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. The project would allow the federal and state water projects to deliver water supplies reliably in a way less harmful to fish. The plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			The commenter is referred to Master Response 45 (Purpose and Need).
1167	1	Stop using our water for fracking, contaminating our water, no thank you.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1168	1	This measure is supported by the oil industry and big agriculture firms as a way to grab excessive amounts of water for themselves at the expense of the majority of Californians living in the cities.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Refer to Master Response 3 for additional information on the purpose and need behind the proposed project. The commenter is also referred to Master Responses: Master Response 35 (Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply), and Master Response 25 (Upstream Reservoir Effects). The project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole and not as a result of oil corporations or large agribusinesses. The environmental documentation and project approval will be acted upon by the decision makers from each lead agency at the conclusion of the final environmental documentation for both CEQA and NEPA.</p>
1168	2	This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our state cannot afford it. We still owe hundreds of millions of dollars to school districts and local agencies, money that was purloined by the state to balance its books during the recession.	The construction of the water delivery facilities would be paid for by the state and federal water contractors who rely on Delta exports. The final cost of water from the new conveyance facilities would be determined by numerous factors. A number of these significant factors, such as the project yield and allocation of costs, have yet to be determined. Funding sources for the BDCP are described in Chapter 8, Implementation Costs and Funding Sources, BDCP. Please see Master Response 5 regarding costs of implementation and funding for the proposed project.
1169	1	Water is precious in our state. It should be saved for the people.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1170	1	I am quite convinced that this project is ill-advised, ecologically speaking.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A. The general comment on ecology does not raise specific</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			environmental issues related to the EIR/EIS documentation.
1171	1	The need of the people is greater than the needs of corporations!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>More than two-thirds of the residents of the state and more than two million acres of highly productive farm land receive water exported from the Delta watershed. The proposed project aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way that is more protective of fish than the current system. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
1172	1	Dear Jerry, You used to be one of the good guys! What in the world happened to you, to cause you to sell out your ideals?	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1173	1	When corporate and big agriculture have exhausted all avenues of water conservation then I would think about helping them out.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the proposed project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.</p>
1174	1	Stop corporate rule!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. The project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole and not as a result of "ruling" by corporations. The environmental documentation and project approval will be acted upon by the decision makers from each lead agency at the conclusion of the final environmental documentation for both CEQA and NEPA.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1175	1	A water desalination plant makes more sense for Santa Barbara County and avoids another pipeline. Corporations should spend more time in this century and use whole system thinking.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>See Master Response 7 for a more detailed discussion of various desalination projects under consideration and in development at this time.</p>
1176	1	Big agriculture and oil should pay a premium for the use of the existing aquaduct.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>More than two-thirds of the residents of the state and more than two million acres of highly productive farm land receive water exported from the Delta watershed. The proposed project aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. However, the project proponents have no authority to designate what water is used for.</p> <p>One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board.</p> <p>The proposed project Lead Agencies have no power to impose penalties on individual water users. DWR and Reclamation have contracts with various entities, some of which sell water to water retailers, who have individual policies and programs to motivate ratepayers to conserve water. Different districts have the right to take different approaches depending on their individual circumstances.</p>
1177	1	These proposed pipelines do not serve any essential purpose, and only benefit the interests of oil companies and growers of water intensive, non-essential but profitable crops at great expense to the majority of citizens, who will never benefit from the profits gained.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The project proposes 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 as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p>
1178	1	We are back to the days of robber barons!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		The rich get richer (and so do the politicians) and the poor get shafted!	<p>Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1179	1	Please, do not fund this boondoggle. This project will only subsidize water to those industries that use almost all of our water currently anyway. Use the money to pay-off our debts, build a surplus fund or reduce taxes for all California businesses and individuals.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The Lead Agencies acknowledge your opposition to the proposed project. Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>The fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <p>Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the BDCP would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p>
1179	2	<p>Def, noun.- A boondoggle is a project that is considered a useless waste of both time and money, yet is often continued due to extraneous policy motivations.</p> <p>The extraneous motivations are primarily cost-ineffective profit pursuits by agriculture and oil that negatively impact taxpayers more than it benefits these two industries.</p>	<p>The Lead Agencies acknowledge your opposition to the proposed project. Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>The fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <p>Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the BDCP would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1180	1	I live near the Oregon border near the Sacramento river headwaters and am very concerned about how such a project will negatively affect our small family farmers and ranchers.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The study area for the purposes of the analysis of impacts of the BDCP on agricultural resources is comprised of the BDCP Plan Area and Areas of Additional Analysis (see Chapter 3), which encompass over 872,000 acres within Alameda, Contra Costa, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Solano, Sutter, and Yolo Counties. Direct or indirect effects on agricultural resources in areas Upstream of the Delta (see Chapter 2) are not anticipated; thus, agricultural resources in these areas are not discussed in the agricultural resources impact analysis.</p>
1181	1	Please do not destroy the Delta!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental impact analysis provided in the EIR/EIS documentation.</p>
1182	1	We all need water, and to propose to send all the water in the Sacramento River to big corporations for their profit, and ignore the needs of California communities and their inhabitants is not reasonable.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1183	1	These criminal corporations care only about their off-shored profits; they care not a whit for the hard-working people of California!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1184	1	No tunnels. It is stupid and irresponsible to irrigate the desert and pave over prime farm land. It is time to stop that.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A. The general comments on water use in deserts or impacts to prime farmland do not raise new issues that weren't already addressed in the EIR/EIS documentation.</p>
1185	1	This is simply too expensive. I would much rather have somewhat faster rail with some of those billions. We should be conserving our water resources, not diverting them to industrial processes such as big agriculture and oil.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and water conservation.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 34 regarding beneficial use of water and Master Responses 5 regarding cost and funding of the proposed project, respectively. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
1186	1	I guess if this goes through I and all my friends, who vote, will pull our vote for you Governor Brown and vote for someone else.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1187	1	Governor Brown, our state is in crisis. Why is this proposal important in the fact of the enormous droughts we are now experiencing? Please do not allow this to pass against the wishes of the people in our state.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed California WaterFix Project is designed to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects would be about the same as average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years with project implementation. Please see Master Response 3 for more information on the purpose and need for the project and Master Response 28 for information regarding operational criteria.</p>
1188	1	I cannot believe the Environmental Protection Agency and other agencies will clear the way for this project. I do not support it and do not want any of my tax dollars spent on this project!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS were raised.</p>
1189	1	<p>I know this sounds old fashioned but what we need is less, not more:</p> <p>less consumption, less insatiable fatness, smaller more reasonable vehicles that move people instead of mainly their own heavy bulk, and fewer people (by way of attrition, of course.) The need for less water goes along with this value system. More is 20th century/Wall Street thinking, aka leaf blower logic.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Appendix 1C of the Final EIR/EIS, Water Demand Management, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. Refer to Master Response 6 for more information on demand management. Although components such as desalination plants and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the State, they are beyond the scope of the project.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1190	1	We, the people, need our water for drinking, cooking, and cleaning.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1190	2	Our ecosystem is in peril because of these industries that rape our resources.	<p>Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Since 2006, the proposed action has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. Also, the Lead Agencies do not have local land use planning/zoning authority over the industries mentioned by the commenter. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects with the project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years, would result in the deliveries being more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the project's purpose and need. The effects of water conveyance facility construction on ecosystem function are addressed throughout Section 4.3.8 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Additionally, discussion of the main environmental attributes affecting individual covered species is provided in Appendix 2.A of the 2013 public draft BDCP. Effects of the proposed water conveyance and associated restoration activities on general biological resource areas are discussed in Ch. 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Resource areas are addressed separately under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible.</p>
1191	1	<p>Conservation is the key to the future. Not massive new infrastructure.</p> <p>Our basic infrastructure is degrading rapidly! Put infrastructure spending into maintenance, not now projects!</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives (such as desalination or water storage) that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
1192	1	If the billionaires want it, let them reach deep into their pockets to pay for this project instead of buying politicians.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The Lead Agencies acknowledge your opposition to the proposed project. Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>The fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <p>Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the BDCP would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p>
1193	1	At a time when our water is so severely compromised along with the fish and other wildlife that goes along with a healthy waterway, to divert an entire water system to another part of the state in response to big business and what it thinks it needs to make more profit is not forward thinking.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. The BDCP, as well as the California WaterFix Project, is one component, among many, of the California Water Action Plan. In its efforts to achieve the co-equal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration, the proposed project seeks to protect dozens of species of fish and wildlife in the Delta while also securing reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California. The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species -- all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. The commenter is also referred to Master Responses: Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), and Master Response 25 (Upstream Reservoir Effects). The issue of large businesses' profits is beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p>
1194	1	The oil industry is already federally subsidized, I am deeply opposed to furthering their profits at my expense as well as further environmental degradation.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Federal subsidies to the oil industry are outside the scope of this CEQA/NEPA analysis.</p>
1195	1	San Franciscans have been asked to reduce our water consumption, and we have done our part, but does this make sense to send more water for big oil and big agriculture companies	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		while we are expected to reduce water usage and then have to pay for such water?	<p>index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>More than two-thirds of the residents of the state and more than two million acres of highly productive farm land receive water exported from the Delta watershed. The proposed project aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. However, the project proponents have no authority to designate what water is used for.</p> <p>One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board.</p> <p>The proposed project Lead Agencies have no power to impose penalties on individual water users. DWR and Reclamation have contracts with various entities, some of which sell water to water retailers, who have individual policies and programs to motivate ratepayers to conserve water. Different districts have the right to take different approaches depending on their individual circumstances.</p>
1196	1	Like the dustbowl billboards along I-5, out of date abusive water management is sickening to me. This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our state cannot afford it. Similar to what the high speed rail naysayers constantly crow. An entire river should not be redirected for the sake of large-scale, unmetered agriculture and the oil industry, and definitely not taxpayer subsidized.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS were raised. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Under the stringent environmental statutes in place today, including the Endangered Species Act, operation of the proposed water delivery system could not drain the Delta rivers and channels dry, including the Sacramento River. The proposed project's facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants, would be operated in accordance with permits issued by, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the State Water Resources Control Board, among other agencies. The proposed project would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Change in Delta Exports), Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply), and Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding).</p>
1197	1	Though infrastructure spending is clearly needed to boost California's economy, this project is a poor one.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The project proposes 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 as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p>
1197	2	It is past time for California to get serious about a permanent building moratorium (except on existing sites with a similar occupation density), and regulation of agricultural water use.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1198	1	Stop supporting industries that are destroying this planet. This is bs.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1199	1	<p>Not again. Less than a month ago, the Senate passed S. 2198 another harmful drought response bill authored by Senator Dianne Feinstein and cosponsored by Senator Barbara Boxer. S. 2198 is proposing a temporary waiving of court issued protections for our endangered species and water quality standards to provide a temporary hydro-fix to wealthy, highly taxpayer subsidized corporate farmers who have paid hundreds of thousands of dollar to our state congress critters; a perfect example of big money trumping established environmental protections.</p> <p>Oh, and it gets better.</p> <p>According to SF Chronicle writer Carolyn Lochhead, "There was no committee hearing, public review or Senate floor debate. It was the product instead of months of closed-door negotiations with various interests, including House Republicans, who passed a drought bill in February that would override environmental laws, " Yes, plutocracy at its best. Long live big bucks.</p> <p>I am appalled that Gov Brown is proposing another water grabbing scheme that, like S. 2198, would throw away environmental safeguards that took years to develop and implement just to enrich the taxpayer subsidized billionaire Resnick family of Paramount Farms, the Kern County Water Bank and fracking companies.</p> <p>Yes, the same Resnick's that fronted Gov. Brown \$102,000 in campaign money.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. Existing water diversions, including the existing State Water Project/Central Valley Project diversions in the southern Delta, can impact water flows and quality. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The project proposes 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 as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p>
1199	2	The agriculture and oil industries are the same groups that sucked the ground water dry and created their own environmental disaster and I refuse to offer any more money or water for their benefit. Like a drug, they will simply demand more and more.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.