

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
800	1	<p>We [San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce] supports rehabilitating the Bay Delta and believe any fix must be undertaken with an eye toward what is appropriate for the entire state. But we are concerned with the absence of a final financing plan for the BDCP. Specifically, without a discussion of the financing mechanism and cost allocation for the proposed mitigation measures, it is impossible to determine what, if any, alternative mitigation measures should be considered if financing for the proposed mitigation measures becomes challenging. Less costly mitigation measures that could be equally or more effective should be considered in the event funding sources for the mitigation measure contemplated cannot be secured. We understand federal and state ESA regulations require funding assurances before permit issuance. An implementation agreement and funding assurances are integral to the permitting process, though neither has been released publicly. Without them, our members are unable to assess the feasibility of the mitigation set forth in the EIR/EIS.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 5 regarding BDCP funding.</p> <p>The costs of many of the mitigation measures in the Final EIR/EIS overlap with many of the costs of the conservation measures. Costs associated with EIR/EIS mitigation measures that are not accounted for in the conservation measures are described in Appendix 8.A, Implementation Costs Supporting Material in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA's requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Comments regarding the environmental analysis of the BDCP or other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the EIR/EIS are addressed in responses to specific comments and are also covered generally in Master Response 5.</p> <p>Although a viable alternative, please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The Final EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A. The Draft Implementing Agreement for the proposed project was made available for public review on May 30, 2014 and the public review period was extended by 46 days until July 29, 2014, in order to accommodate a 60-day review period consistent with the California Natural Community Conservation Planning Act.</p> <p>As described in the May 5, 2014 posting to the BDCP website, the delayed publication of the draft Implementing Agreement was related to availability of key individuals whose drought response duties required significant time commitments, resulting in delays in finalizing the draft Implementing Agreement.</p> <p>Implementing agreements are a requirement under the NCCPA, and are routinely executed under the ESA Section 10 (HCP) permitting process. Since the current proposed project (Alternative 4A) is no longer a NCCP or HCP, an implementing agreement was not released with the RDEIR/SDEIS or final EIR for the project.</p>
800	2	<p>Our members are primarily concerned with how mitigation of the project will be implemented and what, if any, effect the project cost will have on local businesses. Water supply is critical to our region's businesses, as is cost of water supply. The financing plan serves to alert businesses to the cost consequences of the BDCP. Until a final financing plan is provided, we cannot determine how implementation will be funded, nor can we determine whether mitigation can be assured.</p>	<p>Specific mitigation measures are proposed when necessary to avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce or eliminate, or compensate for impacts of the alternatives on the environmental resource areas. A discussion of mitigation measures for impacts from the project can be found in the Final EIR/EIS. The discussion of mitigation measures includes identification of the entity or entities responsible for ensuring that the measure is carried out as specified. See Master Response 22 for information on mitigation measures.</p> <p>For a discussion on the costs of the project and funding mechanisms, please see Master Response 5.</p>
800	3	<p>While we [San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce] understand and support the need to maintain and improve the state's water infrastructure to support its economic vitality, we seek resolution by the appropriate parties of funding issues that have gone unaddressed, and we are also concerned with the absence of a final financing plan for the BDCP. We worry that our region will carry a disproportionate share of the burden of funding the project. We will have no assurances the demand for Bay-Delta water is firm before the Metropolitan Water District (MWD), our imported water supplier, agrees to invest billions of dollars in new infrastructure.</p>	<p>See Responses to Comment 800-1. The preferred alternative, Alternative 4A, no longer includes an HCP/NCCP. Please see Master Responses 4 and 5 for additional detail on the BDCP and the alternatives involving an HCP. Comments regarding the environmental analysis of the BDCP or other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the Draft EIR/EIS are addressed in responses to specific comments and are also covered generally in Master Response 5, including comments on funding.</p>
800	4	<p>We are supportive of local supply development, particularly the City of San Diego's indirect potable water reuse (IPR) project. While we understand a Bay-Delta fix and local supply alternatives are not mutually exclusive, we simply cannot identify the right mix of water supply investments for our community without a comprehensive and thorough analysis of</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the standards of the federal and state ESAs; 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 native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>the cost and benefits of local supply investment and of the BDCP.</p>	<p>operational flexibility.</p>
800	5	<p>The San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce has long advocated for a comprehensive plan for the Bay Delta that would restore the environment and provide a more reliable water supply for the state. We were part of a regional effort that led to the historic Bay-Delta legislation in November 2009, and we recognize the need is heightened during this historic drought. Any comprehensive plan will need to answer critical questions, including those set forth in great detail in the letters from the San Diego County Water Authority. These are the same key questions, meriting response from the appropriate agencies, which the Chamber’s committees and Board of Directors have asked:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Have all local water supply development plans been evaluated and taken into account in assessing the demand for Delta exports and the size of the project (for example, the City of San Diego’s IPR project)? - What will the project cost? - Who will pay for the project? - Will MWD’s member agencies enter into enforceable commitments to pay? - How will the costs be allocated? <p>We [San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce] do not believe we can conduct a cost-benefit analysis or decide whether to support the BDCP without first receiving answers to these questions. Given that San Diego regional ratepayers may be asked to pay the second largest share of the costs in the state, we strongly support the Water Authority’s request to participate directly in the BDCP cost allocation discussions and negotiations process.</p>	<p>See Responses to Comment 800-1. The preferred alternative, Alternative 4A, no longer includes an HCP/NCPP. Please see Master Responses 4 and 5 for additional detail on the BDCP and the alternatives. Comments regarding the environmental analysis of the BDCP or other HCP/NCPP alternatives in the Draft EIR/EIS are addressed in responses to specific comments and are also covered generally in Master Response 5, including comments on funding.</p>
801	1	<p>The Bay Delta Conservation Plan is nothing but window-dressing over a water-grab funded by big agribusiness and foisted off on the taxpayers of California by paid politicians.</p> <p>Six pages into the plan, the big agribusiness bias is evident by listing a Steering Committee (not an Advisory Committee, steering implies giving direction) made up of the very people who are asking to be permitted to kill endangered species, elected government agencies (who take political contributions from those same permit applicants,) and by the way other concerned parties. This tells me immediately that this is anything but an unbiased report.</p>	<p>Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP or NCCP.</p> <p>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 presentations/ Q&As. Documents, studies, administrative drafts, and meeting materials – more than 3,000 documents – have been posted online since 2010 in a commitment to public access and government transparency. Please see Master Response 40 for additional information on the Steering Committee and the public outreach process.</p> <p>The RDEIR/SDEIS Executive Summary, ES.1, identifies and updates from the 2013 Draft EIR the lead and cooperating agencies that will use the EIR/EIS as part of their decision-making process. Reclamation will act as the sole federal Lead Agency of the proposed project (under NEPA) while DWR will continue to act as the state Lead Agency (under CEQA). The USFWS and NMFS will act as NEPA Cooperating Agencies. The regulatory agencies – USFWS, NMFS, CDFW, USACE, and the State Water Board – are participating to provide technical input and guidance in support of planning efforts to complete the proposed project.</p> <p>CDFW would consider whether to approve the project under CESA and issue permits under Section 2081 of the California Fish and Game Code. USFWS and NMFS will make a decision regarding the issuance of Incidental Take Permits for the incidental take of federally listed species under ESA Section 7.</p>
801	2	<p>It is extremely telling that the funding for the drain tunnels have been thought about and</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 5 regarding BDCP Funding. Numerous comments were received that focused on</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		worked out, but the conservation part has not.+	various elements of the BDCP. Where the comments focused on elements of the BDCP that overlap with the elements of Alternatives 2D, 4A, or 5A (e.g., CM1 as it comprises of the North Delta Diversions, tunnels, and supporting facilities), specific responses are presented. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA's requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5. Where comments submitted on the BDCP were focused on elements outside the scope of the environmental analysis or viability of the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives within the context of CEQA/NEPA (e.g., request of specific revisions to the BDCP related to mapping or references), no specific responses are provided and further consideration will be given to these comments, and any revisions to the Draft BDCP would only be made, if an HCP/NCCP alternative was ultimately approved at the conclusion of the CEQA/NEPA process.
801	3	I have lived in the Delta my entire life. I have personally seen the decline in my lifetime that has been caused by increasing removal of fresh water from the system. The idea of building two giant drain tunnels to make this even worse is horrifying to me, and unthinkable to anyone who lives in what will be the decimated region.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS documentation were raised. 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.
801	4	It makes it even more ridiculous that, after the corrupt construction administration of the state took 11 years (7 over schedule) and \$6.4 billion dollars (5x the original budget) to build the bay bridge, you want to put the same corrupt construction administration in charge of a 50-year project that would cost \$24.5 billion dollars (at Bay Bridge schedules that means the project would take 79 years and \$142 billion **without inflation** dollars).	Please see Master Response 5 for additional discussion of public benefits and funding.
801	5	I am completely behind agriculture making money, but not at the cost of killing my Delta, and that is exactly what this plan does. Take this plan, completely scrap anything and everything to do with the drain tunnels, use the construction money to buy out the desert that is the Westlands Water district and turn it back into publically-owned grazing acreage, then implement the conservation portion of this plan.	The commenter's opposition to the project is acknowledged.
801	6	Almost everyone who lives here in the Delta is vehemently against the Delta drain tunnels project and will fight it tooth and nail at every opportunity. Save The Delta placards and signs are up in every other yard and bumper sticker that you see driving across the Delta, this is a horrible plan that is sure to kill off towns here in the Delta that rely on what the fresh water brings us.	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. Please note the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP component. For points raised by the commenter, please refer to the following: Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 5 (Conservation Measure 1 as a CM, Overview of Restoration and Enhancement Activities), Master Response 4 (Tunnel Alternative), Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), and Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place). Chapter 16 of the EIR/EIS (Socioeconomics) identifies the unique features of the Delta and describes the potential effects on Delta communities. 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 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.
801	7	Please, please scrap this plan altogether and work on something that does not have (the cynically described) co-equal goals and just has one goal -- save the Delta!	This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. For detailed responses on the primary issues being raised with regard to the BDCP or Alternative 4, as well as a discussion of the current status of the draft BDCP Effects Analysis, please see Master Response 5.
802	1	I would like to understand the process by which you arrived at the proposed tunnel and intake solution to provide California with the water supply mentioned in the BDCP? Can you	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. By establishing a point of

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>point me towards the other engineering options you considered as part of the process?</p>	<p>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> <p>15 alternatives and 3 new subalternatives were analyzed in the EIR/S and the RDEIR/RSEIS respectively. Four major alignments have been included in the EIR/S: Through-Delta, East of the Sacramento River, West of the Sacramento River, and a Tunnel under the Delta. Many additional proposals by public and private individuals and organizations have also been evaluated and described in Chapter 3 of the BDCP EIR/S and Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1.</p> <p>Regarding development of alternatives for the EIR/EIS, a description of the process the Lead Agencies followed to develop and screen alternatives is provided in Master Response 4.</p> <p>The Department of Water Resources released in 2013 the Conceptual Engineering Report that describes design details of the modified pipeline/tunnel option (MPTO). For more information regarding tunnel research and design please see http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/Conceptual_Engineering_Report-Modified_Pipeline_Tunnel_Option.sflb.ashx.</p> <p>Please see Appendix 3F, Intake Location Analysis, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS, regarding the process for selecting intake locations analyzed in the BDCP and EIR/EIS. As shown in Figure 3F-1, and described in the appendix, several sites north of the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Outfall were considered in earlier stages of review (Locations A, B, and C). Locations upstream of the town of Freeport were eliminated from consideration due to public scoping comments received in March 2009 citing construction impacts in an overly constrained conveyance corridor, historic building conflicts, and the precedent set by the Freeport Regional Water Project EIR, indicating that intakes in the Pocket area neighborhood would produce significant impacts. However, the Fish Facilities Technical Team also recommended that the furthest upstream intake be located downstream of where complete mixing is reported to occur with effluent discharge from the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Facility. For this reason, potential intake locations upstream of Scribner’s bend were also eliminated.</p>
803	1	<p>The Town of Discovery Bay, located in eastern Contra Costa County, is the largest residential water-based community on the environmentally sensitive California Delta. The Delta is the lifeblood of our community. The Delta and its ecosystem singularly sustain the largest estuary on the Pacific Coast and it is home to a myriad of fish, waterfowl, and mammals, many of them endangered. The Delta offers countless recreational opportunities as well, including boating, fishing, bird watching, hunting and many others. Most importantly, however, the Delta is also home to the farms and fields that feed America.</p> <p>The BDCP proposes to make physical and operational improvements to the State and Federal water projects in the Delta claiming to protect reliable future water supplies and to restore and protect ecosystem health in the Delta. Unfortunately, the BDCP as proposed fails to accomplish either of these purposes and the Draft EIR/EIS inadequately analyses impacts to the Delta ecosystem, water quality and supply, and communities.</p>	<p>Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP.</p> <p>The Lead Agencies respectfully disagree that the environmental documentation does not adequately assess the impacts to the Delta ecosystem, water quality and supply, and communities. See Master Response 17 regarding biological resources (and the RDEIR/SEIS, including Sections 4, 5, and Appendix A (e.g., Chapter 5 [Water Supply], Chapter 8 [Water Quality], Chapter 11 [Fish and Aquatic Resources], and Chapter 12 [Terrestrial Biological Resources]). Chapter 16 of the Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A (Socioeconomics) identifies the unique features of the Delta and describes the potential effects on Delta communities. Chapter 15 evaluates impacts to recreation. Impacts and mitigations to agriculture are identified and discussed in Chapter 14. Refer to Master Response 18 for information on agricultural impact mitigation.</p> <p>The proposed project may impact recreational opportunities including impacts on hunting, fishing, swimming, and boating. Mitigation is proposed to reduce these impacts; however, some impacts may remain significant due to the long-term nature of the temporary construction related impacts. Please see</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Chapter 15, Recreation, and Section 4.3.11 for more detail on the impacts of the proposed project on recreational opportunities and the proposed mitigation.</p> <p>To compensate for the loss of access as a result of constructing the river intakes, the proponents will work with the California Department of Parks and Recreation to help insure the elements of the proposed project would not conflict with the elements proposed in DPR's Recreation Proposal for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and Suisun Marsh (California Department of Parks and Recreation 2011d) that would enhance bicycle and foot access to the Delta. This would include the helping to fund or construct elements of the American Discovery Trail and the potential conversion of the abandoned Southern Pacific Railroad rail line that formerly connected Sacramento to Walnut Grove.</p>
803	2	<p>The Town of Discovery Bay Community Services District Board of Directors believe that implementation of the BDCP, and particularly the construction of the dual conveyance system allegedly designed to reduce the amount of fresh Sacramento River water flowing into and through the Delta, would cause additional and significant deterioration of an already sensitive Delta ecosystem. The Delta ecosystem has shown increasing signs of stress as the natural hydrology has been altered by the operations of the State and Federal Water Projects in the Delta. Salt-water intrusions have continued to move upstream for many years, more and more native species are being threatened, and increased water diversions have resulted in substantial degradation of water quality. Less water flowing into and through the Delta would exacerbate these problems rather than resolve them.</p>	<p>The commenter's opinion related to the project is acknowledged. The proposed project provides for implementing conservation actions that are intended to improve ecological conditions for Delta species. Please see Master Response 5 (BDCP) and Master Response 17 (Biological Resources) for further information.</p>
803	3	<p>The dual conveyance system's draw on the Sacramento River will substantially upset the extensive network of levees, rivers, and dams in the Delta region. Fisheries and fish habitats will be impacted as less fresh water is introduced to the system. Brackish water would move much further upstream resulting in further degradation of the Delta and the destruction of a large portion of the rich agricultural industry that provides many of the food crops for America. The BDCP and the dual conveyance system will result in significant ecosystem, fishery, flood control, and water quality impacts which are not sufficiently analyzed in the Draft EIR/EIS.</p>	<p>The three major environmental concerns raised by the commenter have been examined in the Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS. Borings will be performed and soil samples will be collected along the existing levee crown and levee landside toe, as well as at varying distances away from the existing levee landside toe, based on the proposed layout of each intake site of conveyance alternatives. The type, number, depth, and spacing of borings will be in accordance with published agency guidelines, including USACE Sacramento District - Geotechnical Levee Practice, and USACE - Geotechnical Investigations. The California Department of Water Resources' Levee Repairs and Floodplain Management Office is responsible for administering levee programs through evaluation and direct rehabilitation of structural deficiencies in California's levee system. Overall levee repairs and improvement programs administered by DWR will continue with available funding. For additional information on the relationship between the proposed project and Flood protections in the Delta, please see FEIR/FEIS Appendix 6A BDCP/California WaterFix Coordination with Flood Management Requirements. For issues related to salinity (i.e., increases in brackish water content) affecting fisheries and fish habitats, refer to Master Response 14 (Water Quality). The effects of constructing the water conveyance facility on brackish water ecosystems are described in Section 4.3.8 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Impacts to agriculture are discussed in Chapter 14. See Master Response 18 for information on agricultural impact mitigation. The Lead Agencies respectfully disagree that the environmental documentation does not adequately assess the impacts to the ecosystem, fishery, flood control, and water quality. In addition, please refer to the RDEIR/SDEIS including Sections 4, 5, and Appendix A (e.g., Chapter 6 [Surface Water], Chapter 8 [Water Quality], Chapter 11 [Fish and Aquatic Resources], and Chapter 12 [Terrestrial Biological Resources]).</p>
803	4	<p>The dual conveyance system, in its present proposed alignment, crosses directly in, through and adjacent to the Town of Discovery Bay on its way to the Clifton Court Forebay. The environmental impacts that will be caused as a result of the construction and ongoing project maintenance will forever change the relationship between the Discovery Bay community, the environmental stewardship of the Delta, and the economic and significant cultural resources of the Delta region. These significant impacts are not adequately addressed in the Draft EIR/EIS.</p>	<p>The lead agencies believe the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS and 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS have adequately and sufficiently identified and disclosed potential impacts and proposed mitigation for those impacts. The Federal and State Lead Agencies have done their best to make the EIR/EIS for the proposed project as fair, objective, and complete as possible. The Lead Agencies are following the appropriate legal processes and are complying with CEQA and NEPA in preparing the EIR/EIS for the proposed project. These agencies readily acknowledge, however, that the document addresses a number of topics for which some scientific uncertainty exists. Such uncertainty can give rise to differing opinions as to what conclusions may be reached. 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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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, public health, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible.</p> <p>The Cumulative Impact Analyses that were written for the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS have been revised to include the impacts associated with the new proposed project alternatives and also updates past analyses. Environmental Commitments are to minimize effects to the Delta and its inhabitants and mitigate for loss of habitat to the ecosystem and its species. For more information please see Section 5 Revisions to Cumulative Impact Analyses, Appendix A Chapter 11 Fish and Aquatic Resources, Appendix A Chapter 12 Terrestrial Biological Resources, and Appendix 3B Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs of the RDEIR/SDEIS. For additional information regarding cumulative impacts analyses please see Master Response 9.</p>
803	5	<p>The BDCP, and the dual conveyance system, will not resolve California's ongoing water issues. Rather, it will degrade the Delta environment, ecosystem, and communities. We urge you to reconsider your support of the BDCP and join the millions of Americans who believe water conservation and water storage projects are more environmentally preferable than the dual conveyance system.</p>	<p>The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A 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. Master Response 4 clarifies further the selection of alternatives analyzed and Master Response 6 discusses demand management. 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. For other issues raised, refer to Response to Comment 803- 3.</p> <p>The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta. Although conservation components, water storage, 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.</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.</p> <p>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. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well.</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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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 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.</p>
803	6	The Town of Discovery Bay believes that the current Draft EIR/EIS is technically and legally inadequate, as it does not comply with the provisions of CEQA, CEQA Guidelines, and NEPA. Accordingly, we urge you to deny the Draft EIR/EIS.	The joint RDEIR/SDEIS was prepared in compliance with the requirements of CEQA and NEPA. Before the selection and approval of an alternative considered, the Lead Agencies must comply with the necessary state and federal environmental review requirements. The FEIR/FEIS, along with the Draft EIR/EIS, and the RDEIR/SDEIS are intended to provide sufficient CEQA and NEPA support for approval of the proposed project or any of the action alternatives for either compliance strategy. The commenter does not offer any evidence on how the CEQA/NEPA documents are technically and legally inadequate to comply with CEQA and NEPA.
804	1	SFPP, L.P. has operating product pipelines that are within the Restoration Opportunity Area Conservation Zone 11. The draft EIR/EIS includes plans for areas of habitat restoration and habitat protection within the ROA. The establishment of new restored and protected areas should not place limits on the performance of routine maintenance activities on the existing pipelines. SFPP, L.P. would be pleased to provide further information regarding routine maintenance activities on the pipelines if requested.	<p>Please note, the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP.</p> <p>The Lead Agencies will coordinate with all appropriate utility providers impacted by construction of the proposed project.</p>
805	1	The Conservation Measures include construction of new water conveyance infrastructure and restoration of various types of habitat. Many of the proposed actions will occur on or around facilities of the State Plan of Flood Control (SPFC) including modifications to the Sacramento River Flood Control Project (SRFCP). The SRFCP is the core of the flood protection system along the Sacramento River and tributaries and includes most of the levees, weirs, control structures, bypass channels, and river channels that comprise the SPFC. These levees are relied upon today to provide flood protection during major storms to over 2 million people in approximately 50 communities with an estimated \$37 billion in urban and agricultural development. [footnote 1: American River Common Features Project, Natomas Post Authorization Change Report and Interim General Re- evaluation Report, USACE, October 2010, page 1-20.]	<p>Please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The proposed BDCP habitat restoration and stressor reduction measures (i.e., CM2 through CM21) that are presented in the Draft BDCP, including the Yolo Bypass Enhancements, are not carried forward fully for California WaterFix (Alternative 4A), except where elements of the former conservation measures are retained to mitigate the potential impacts of the proposed project in compliance with CEQA, NEPA, and other environmental regulatory permitting requirements.</p> <p>Please see Appendix 6A (BDCP/California WaterFix Coordination with Flood Management Requirements), Section 6A.6.4, FEIR/EIS, for a discussion on impacts from restoration-related environmental commitments and conservation measures, including the removal of Conservation Measure 2 (Yolo Bypass Enhancements) and substantial reductions in the amount of planned habitat restoration under the new proposed project, Alternative 4A. Instead, Yolo Bypass Enhancements would be assumed to occur as part of the No Action Alternative because they are required by the existing BiOps.</p> <p>Also, see Section 6A.6.2.1.3.1 for discussion on DWR consistency with the State Plan of Flood Control (SPFC), and Section 6A6.1.2 and 6A.6.2 for information on project consistency with USACE, CVFPB, and DWR flood standards and regulations.</p> <p>For more information regarding floods and levees please see Appendix 6A.</p>
805	2	The Board is an independent state agency required at all times to enforce on behalf of the State the erection, maintenance and protection of the levees, embankments and channel rectification as will, in the Board’s judgment, best serve the interests of the State. [footnote 2: See California Water Code [Section] 8534.] In accordance with Water Code Section 8608, the Board is charged with establishing and enforcing standards for the maintenance and operation of levees, channels, and other flood control works of an authorized project or an adopted plan, including but not limited to standards for encroachment , construction, vegetation and erosion control measures. The jurisdiction of the Board encompasses the	Please response to comment 1, above. For more information regarding alternatives to the proposed project please see Master Response 4.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Central Valley, including all tributaries and distributaries of the Sacramento River, the San Joaquin River, and designated floodways. [footnote 3: 23 C.C.R., Section 2.] The Board also has all the responsibilities and authorities necessary to oversee future modifications of the SPFC as approved by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) pursuant to assurance agreements with the USACE and the USACE Operation and Maintenance Manuals under Code of Federal Regulations, Title 33, Section 208.10 and United States Code, Title 33, Section 408.</p> <p>The Board has reviewed the DEIR/EIS and BDCP for consistency with these mandates in order to ensure the BDCP proponents consider these important flood control concerns in implementing the BDCP. In accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21002, it is the policy of the State that public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental impacts of such projects, and that the procedures required by this division are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects.</p>	
805	3	<p>Chapter One of the DEIR/EIS describes the relationship to other conservation plans in the Delta. Chapter 7 discusses regulatory compliance with a number of other agency permits that may be required for BDCP implementation. Chapter 13 discusses the "on the ground" regulatory environment, including those agencies with land use authority in the study area. The DEIR/EIS includes project features that have the potential to impair or impede implementation of the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP) [footnote 4: Water Code Section 9613(a)(3)] a requirement of the Central Valley Flood Protection Act of 2008. The CVFPP is a comprehensive framework for system wide flood management and flood risk reduction for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins. [footnote 5: See Ca. Water Code [Section] 9603(b).] The CVFPP was unanimously adopted by the Board in June 2012 . The primary objective of the CVFPP is to improve flood risk management, including both facilities and formulation of standards, criteria and guidelines to facilitate actions to protect urban areas and other lands of the Sacramento and San Joaquin river basins and the Delta. The CVFPP must be updated every five years, and current efforts are underway for the 2017 update.</p> <p>Recommendation: All Conservation Measures with the potential to affect the State Plan of Flood Control should be analyzed for consistency with the state system wide investment approach outlined in the 2012 CVFPP and in accord with any applicable guidelines, standards or criteria developed as part of the CVFPP in effect at the time of BDCP implementation.</p>	<p>State and Federal agencies developed the modified proposed project (Alternative 4A/California WaterFix) in response to public and agency input. Alternative 4A reflects the State's proposal to separate the conveyance facility and other non-conveyance habitat restoration measures into two separate efforts: California WaterFix and California EcoRestore. The Proposed Action includes habitat restoration as necessary to mitigate significant environmental effects and satisfy applicable ESA and CESA standards.</p> <p>Please see Appendix 6A (BDCP/California WaterFix Coordination with Flood Management Requirements), Section 6A.6.2.1.3, FEIR/EIS, for a discussion on DWR consistency with the State Plan of Flood Control (SPFC), and Section 6A.6.1.2 for information on project consistency with USACE, CVFPB, and DWR flood standards and regulations.</p>
805	4	<p>BDCP conservation measures must include analysis of the impact to the SPFC operations and maintenance.</p> <p>Since the release of the Administrative Draft EIR for the BDCP in 2013, the planning efforts for ecosystem restoration within lands under the jurisdiction of the Board have been further clarified. According to the DEIR, page 3-123, "Any modification to the Yolo Bypass or other CM2 [Conservation Measure 2] actions would be required to be designed and implemented to maintain flood conveyance capacity at the design flow level and to comply with other flood management standards and permitting processes. These activities would be coordinated, as appropriate, with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Department of Water Resources, Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB), and other flood management</p>	<p>Please see Appendix 6A (BDCP/California WaterFix Coordination with Flood Management Requirements), Section 6A.6.4, FEIR/EIS, for a discussion on impacts from restoration-related environmental commitments and conservation measures.</p> <p>Please see Section 6A.6 in Appendix 6A for a discussion on levees modified by construction of the California WaterFix (CWF), including responsibilities of the project proponents.</p> <p>Before and/or during construction of the CWF water conveyance facilities, project proponents will explore opportunities with local reclamation districts and the Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB) to address potential conflicts regarding levee maintenance, inspection, and flood fighting activities on project and non-project levees. DWR will look to enter into agreements with local reclamation districts with</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>agencies."</p> <p>The jurisdiction of the Board includes the Central Valley, including all tributaries and distributaries of the Sacramento River, the San Joaquin River, designated floodways and regulated streams. [footnote 6: 23 C.C.R, Section 112.] According to the DEIR, BDCP restoration and mitigation features will be constructed within the State Plan of Flood Control regulated streams under the jurisdiction of the Board, including the following:</p> <p>Georgiana Slough (Sacramento County);</p> <p>Sacramento River (From Kenwick Dam -to west end of Sherman Island);</p> <p>Mokelumne River (Sacramento County, San Joaquin County - to Camanche Reservoir); San Joaquin River (Friant Dam to West End of Sherman Island);</p> <p>Sacramento Deep Water Channel (Solano and Yolo); Sacramento Bypass (Yolo County);</p> <p>Old River (San Joaquin to Paradise Cut); Three Mile Slough (Sacramento County); Sevenmile Slough (Sacramento County); Threemile Slough (Sacramento County); Elk Slough (Yolo County);</p> <p>Duck Slough (Yolo County); Miner Slough (Solano County);</p> <p>Sutter Slough (Counties of Solano, Sacramento, Yolo); Steamboat Slough (Counties of Solano, Sacramento, Yolo); Cache Slough (Solano County);</p> <p>Cache Creek (Yolo County, Yolo Bypass to mile west of Interstate 5); Putah Creek (Counties of Yolo, Solano - to Monticello Dam);</p> <p>Putah Creek, South Fork (Solano County); Sycamore Slough (Colusa County);</p> <p>Haas Slough (Solano County); Hastings Cut (Solano County); Lindsey Slough (Solano County);</p> <p>Shag Slough (Counties of Solano, Yolo); Yolo Bypass (Counties of Yolo, Solano)</p> <p>The BDCP likewise proposes to modify floodways under the Board's jurisdiction. According to the DEIR, pages 3-123 Yolo Bypass Fisheries Enhancement (Conservation Measure 2), includes "...modifications to the Yolo Bypass that, in balance with existing uses, would benefit covered fish by increasing the frequency, duration, and magnitude of floodplain inundation and improving fish passage."</p> <p>State and local flood management agencies responsible for levee maintenance and vegetation management are subject to significant increases in their maintenance costs when implementing vegetation control measures adjacent to existing habitat within the floodways. Habitat restoration projects increases populations of protected species that live on levees operated and maintained by local maintaining agencies.</p> <p>According to the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan page 1-20, "System maintenance will continue to be challenged by the need to complete annual maintenance activities such as mowing grass, trimming trees and brush, filling burrows, clearing sediment, and restoring patrol roads while at the same time minimizing impacts on migrating fish, nesting birds, and hibernating snakes. The result is a combination of rapidly rising costs, shortening</p>	<p>jurisdiction in the Delta to ensure levee management activities by both government and local agencies are not interrupted during construction of the water conveyance facilities. In addition, DWR will comply with all applicable flood protection requirements and regulations to ensure flood neutrality during construction and operations of the CWF.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>maintenance windows, high mitigation costs, and uncertainty".</p> <p>Levee maintenance costs are significant with expenses ranging up to \$90,000 per levee mile including increased costs to protect threatened or endangered species that live in animal burrows within levees. [footnote 7: FY 2014/2015 Levee Maintenance Budget, DWR Flood Maintenance Office.] Levee repairs to remove animal burrows in levees are often delayed due to regulatory compliance measures. Delays in repairing animal burrows within the levees increases flood risks due to potential water seepage through animal burrows within levees.</p> <p>Recommendation: All Conservation Measures in the BDCP with the potential to impact the operations and maintenance of the State Plan of Flood Control, including habitat restoration projects and multi-benefit projects that increase or enhance existing habitat in or around floodways and system levees, should be analyzed for impacts to the operations and maintenance of the SPFC. State and local maintaining agencies should be consulted prior to implementing Conservation Measures in the floodways and system levees. The BDCP should identify ways to integrate long-term management of the system that serves both public safety and environmental needs.</p>	
805	5	<p>Proposed ecosystem restoration projects within the Yolo Bypass must be consistent with Title 23 standards.</p> <p>Modifications proposed by the BDCP include increasing the flood frequency within the Yolo Bypass where flows are allowed to spill from the Sacramento River into the bypass system through the Fremont Weir and the Sacramento Weir. These weirs are significant over flow locations in the flood control system and provide flood protection based on their ability to convey up to 80% of the flow of the Sacramento River basin during high water events. The weirs' primary purpose was to release overflow waters of the Sacramento River, Sutter Bypass, and the Feather River into the Yolo Bypass. Spills into the Yolo Bypass could be reduced due to back water effects caused by the deferred maintenance of vegetation and sedimentation within the floodway.</p> <p>The need to ensure adequate flood flow design capacity is a critical flood safety concern for the Board and local maintaining agencies. According to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, "Fortunately, the levees in the Sacramento area have not been overtopped in recent flood events, although several floods have come close. However, it is possible that a large enough flood event could occur that would overtop the Sacramento levees. In past flooding, levees upstream have failed, relieving some of the pressure on the Sacramento area. But as repairs to these levees are made, it increases the flood risk to Sacramento as project levees could face the full brunt of the flood event. Because these levees were not built to modern engineering standards and levee failures upstream are assumed not to occur, levee overtopping would potentially lead to failure of the levee and cause devastating flooding." [footnote 8: American River Common Features Project, Natomas Post Authorization Change Report and Interim General Re-evaluation Report, USACE, October 2010, page 2-13.]</p> <p>Flow in the Sacramento River is reduced by spilling floodwater into the Yolo Bypass through the Fremont and Sacramento weirs. Increasing the frequency and duration of floodplain inundation may increase the need for vegetation management and sediment removal to maintain the ability to convey design flood flows. According to the Department of Water Resources Flood Control System Status Report, page A-20, "Freeboard results show that portions of both banks of the Sutter Bypass, both banks of the Yolo Bypass...do not meet freeboard criteria." The design of proposed ecosystem restoration projects without fully</p>	<p>Please see Appendix 6A (BDCP/California WaterFix Coordination with Flood Management Requirements), Section 6A.6.2.1.3, FEIR/EIS, for a discussion on DWR consistency with the State Plan of Flood Control (SPFC), and Section 6A.6.1.2 for information on project consistency with USACE, CVFPB, and DWR flood standards and regulations. Also, see Section 6A.6.4 for a discussion on impacts of restoration-related environmental commitments and conservation measures, including the removal of Conservation Measure 2 under the new proposed project, Alternative 4A. Instead, the Yolo Bypass Enhancements would be assumed to occur as part of the No Action Alternative because they are required by the existing BiOps.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>considering the Supplemental Standards of Section 136 may result in cumulative adverse hydraulic impacts in both upstream and downstream reaches of the Fremont Weir and Sacramento Weir.</p> <p>Projects within the Yolo Bypass are required to obtain a Board permit and comply with 23 Section 136 Supplemental Standards for Yolo Bypass and Sutter Bypass including the following:</p> <p>"(a) Final detailed plans for all construction, grading and planting must be submitted to and approved by the board prior to the start of work.</p> <p>(b) A detailed operation and maintenance plan must be submitted to and approved by the board prior to the start of work.</p> <p>(c) A profile of the existing levee crown roadway and access ramps that will be utilized for access to and from the construction area must be submitted to the board prior to the start of work.</p> <p>(d) Any damage to the levee crown roadway or access ramps attributable to the construction or maintenance of croplands or wetlands must be promptly repaired by the permittee.</p> <p>(e) The planting of vegetation or the impoundment of water is not permitted within one thousand (1,000) feet of the Fremont Weir structure.</p> <p>(f) The planting of vegetation or the impoundment of water shall not be permitted in any area where there could be an adverse hydraulic impact.</p> <p>(g) Irrigated and nonirrigated pastures and croplands are allowed without permit from the Board when consistent with the board's flowage easements.</p> <p>(h) The planting of vegetation is generally permitted for the development of native marsh, riparian vegetation and wetlands.</p> <p>(i) Rooted vegetation and aquatic beds of floating (nonrooted) or submerged vegetation are generally permitted to be established in ponded water.</p> <p>(j) The depth of ponded water must be controlled to prevent the growth of unauthorized vegetation that could adversely affect the operation of the flood control project.</p> <p>(k) No permanent berms or dikes are permitted above natural ground elevation without a detailed hydraulic analysis except where otherwise expressly provided for in reservations contained in easement deeds to the Sacramento and San Joaquin Drainage District.</p> <p>(l) required maintenance may include removal, clearing, thinning, and pruning of all vegetation directly or indirectly resulting from the permitted project. "</p> <p>Prior to implementation of any Conservation Measure in the Yolo or Sutter Bypasses, the BDCP should identify the existing conveyance capacity of the Yolo Bypass and provide an accurate representation of the effect on flood elevations resulting from the various conceptual ecosystem improvements examined within the BDCP. System design plans should identify actual conveyance capacity of the Yolo Bypass which is now based on historical high water events. The hydraulic analyses should include Lower Cache Creek</p>	

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>sedimentation entering the Yolo Bypass and evaluate alternatives to avoid decreasing design flows in the study area which includes the Yolo Bypass. [footnote 9: Review Plan Lower Cache Creek, Yolo County, Feasibility Study, USAGE, August 2010, page 7.]</p> <p>Recommendation: All projects proposed within the Yolo Bypass should comply with Title 23, Section 136 Supplemental Standards for Yolo Bypass and Sutter Bypass. The supplemental standards protect the flood control functions, safeguard existing agricultural land use, and control the development of proposed wetlands. To the extent the proposed modifications to the Yolo Bypass have the potential to reduce conveyance capacity and/or to divert flows upstream and through the Sacramento River, those modifications should only be considered after a conveyance capacity impact analysis is run.</p>	
805	6	<p>The BDCP must analyze impacts to levee roads resulting from increased traffic during BDCP implementation.</p> <p>The BDCP construction activities will result in transportation impacts to levees. According to p. 19-189, "In particular, implementation of CM2 and CM3-CM10 would generate traffic on area roadways during implementation due to transport of construction vehicles, equipment, and employees to and from the sites for the purposes of modifying or installing new facilities, or making changes in operation of existing facilities. Because the specific areas for implementing these conservation measures have not been determined, this effect is evaluated qualitatively."</p> <p>A qualitative traffic analysis is insufficient to analyze potential damage to levee roadways. The BDCP alternatives include truck haul routes using levee crown roadways for extended periods. Impacts to levees from excessive load, dynamic impacts, or traffic can include deformation and crest depression due to non-uniform settlement and damage to levee slopes due to use of levee hinge points for vehicle turn-outs. These impacts could result in loss of levee integrity, leading to levee failures.</p> <p>Recommendation: Whenever haul routes or construction zones include travel over levee roads, the BDCP should implement mitigation measures, including pre-project inspections and levee geometry surveys including the elevations of levee crests and waterside and landside hinge points, and continuous monitoring during construction for evidence of levee deformation. Traffic control measures should include reducing truck speed limits and limiting the number of trucks on the levee during flood seasons. Levee deformation (either vertical or lateral) should be mitigated and be restored in accordance with project levee designs pursuant to Board and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.</p>	<p>The proposed BDCP habitat restoration and stressor reduction measures (i.e., CM2 through CM21) that are presented in the Draft BDCP, including the Yolo Bypass Enhancements, are not carried forward fully for California WaterFix (Alternative 4A), except where elements of the former conservation measures are retained to mitigate the potential impacts of the proposed project in compliance with CEQA, NEPA, and other environmental regulatory permitting requirements.</p> <p>Please see Appendix 6A (BDCP/California WaterFix Coordination with Flood Management Requirements), Section 6A.6.3.2, FEIR/EIS, for information on potential impacts to levee road integrity due to increases in construction traffic, and Chapter 19 (Transportation) for impacts to levee roads.</p> <p>Borings will be performed and soil samples will be collected along the existing levee crown and levee landside toe, as well as at varying distances away from the existing levee landside toe, based on the proposed layout of each intake site of conveyance alternatives. The type, number, depth, and spacing of borings will be in accordance with published agency guidelines, including USACE Sacramento District - Geotechnical Levee Practice, and USACE - Geotechnical Investigations.</p>
805	7	<p>The Board has all the responsibilities and authorities necessary to oversee future modifications or additions to the State Plan of Flood Control as approved by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers pursuant to assurance agreements with the USACE and the USACE Operation and Maintenance Manuals under Code of Federal Regulations, Title 33, Section 208.10 and United States Code, Title 33, Section 408 .</p> <p>USACE policy requires the Board to serve as the lead non-Federal sponsor for projects to improve or alter facilities of the SPFC pursuant to Code of Federal Regulations, Title 33, Section 408 . The State's objectives include fulfilling the USACE's expectations pursuant to assurances given by the Board to the USACE to operate and maintain the SPFC facilities.</p> <p>Conservation Measure 1 of the BDCP includes the construction of new State Water Project conveyance facilities including water intakes, pumping plants, tunnels, access shafts,</p>	<p>Please see Appendix 6A (BDCP/California WaterFix Coordination with Flood Management Requirements), Section 6A.3.1, FEIR/EIS, for a discussion on DWR consistency with the State Plan of Flood Control (SPFC), and Section 6A.6.1 for information on project consistency with USACE, CVFPB, and DWR flood standards and regulations.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>forebays, canals, earthen embankments, and extensive supporting facilities on adjacent lands.</p> <p>According to the DEIR, Chapter 6 Surface Water, p. 6-36, 'The Central Valley Flood Protection Board and the USACE are primarily responsible for the levees along the Sacramento River. Under California Water Code Section 8536 and related regulations, the CVFPB has no jurisdiction or authority over the construction, operation, or maintenance of the CVP or SWP. However, DWR will consult with these agencies to ensure that all construction of new structures or levee modifications within the waterways will not adversely affect the flood profile, and that the integrity of the levees is not degraded by structures that are constructed under, over, or through the levees.'</p> <p>Recommendation: BDCP documents should properly reference the Board as the non-federal sponsor for any project proposed to modify a SPFC facility. Even if the project is determined to be exempt from Board authority per Water Code [Section] 8536, the State retains the obligation to ensure those projects are compliant with the Operations and Maintenance Manuals and Assurance Agreements given to the USACE by the State. Therefore , any proposed project that can affect a SPFC facility should be approved by the Board either under its permitting authority or in conjunction with its duties as the non-federal sponsor for levee modification projects submitted to the USACE.</p> <p>In summary, any modification or encroachment into the SPFC must not impair or impede implementation of the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan and have no adverse impact on design flows. A flood protection system cannot be relied upon if it has not been properly maintained. Future plans for the implementation of the BDCP should include Board review and concurrence of BDCP project plans, and Board staff should be a part of any design review or peer review panel that may be assembled in the future to discuss design criteria for conveyance facilities.</p>	
806	1	<p>I would like to start off by saying that I am very happy to see that conservation and protection of California's Delta is being taken seriously. The fact that the BDCP plan includes restoring many parts of the Delta. I am still a little skeptical of the idea to take more water than before. I feel that doing it this way should cause less damage.</p> <p>This brings me to the point of writing this letter. I feel that while the BDCP plan is thorough, it has an oversight. That oversight being the usage of the water pulled from the Delta. Not only are citizens over-using and wasting our water, but so is the agriculture in our state. I feel that awareness should be made about the inefficient watering practices being used by the agriculture in our state. Along with the proposal to add into the BDCP plan is a reform of water usage regulation.</p>	<p>To improve Delta habitat conditions, Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 8 evaluated in the project EIR/EIS decrease monthly total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase flows in the winter months when the river flows are high. For example, long-term average flows in the Sacramento River flows at Freeport under Alternative 4H4 could be up to 3 percent higher in June and 5 percent lower in January as compared to the No Action Alternative (as shown in Table C-20.20 of Appendix 5A, Section C, EIR/EIS). Overall, the average annual Delta exports are less in Alternatives 2, 4 (H2, H3, H4), and 5 through 9 than under Existing Conditions, as shown in Figure 5-17 of Chapter 5, Water Supply, of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Agricultural areas served by SWP and CVP water supplies also depend upon groundwater (as discussed in Chapter 7, Groundwater) and other surface waters. The project EIR/EIS water supply analysis (as presented in Chapter 5, Water Supply) analyzes the availability of SWP and CVP water supplies for agricultural, municipal/industrial water, and environmental uses. The results from the CALSIM II model runs are subsequently analyzed to determine effects on groundwater use, and that analysis assumes that irrigation efficiency efforts have been completed under the No Action Alternative and other EIR/EIS alternatives.</p>
806	2	<p>A majority of the farms in California use an irrigation system known as flood irrigation. Flood irrigation is a very inefficient system in water amount usage, while it is beneficial in the idea of speed, ease of use and convenience. We as a state can no longer afford these wasteful but convenient systems. Flood irrigation has a tendency to lose a lot of water to both evaporation and over watering of the soil. It also can aid in the salinization of soil at a quicker rate due to the large amounts of water used. This must be stopped and a more</p>	<p>The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. 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 conservation as well as other water supplies such a recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>efficient system be mandated to be used. Center pivot and drip irrigation should be enforced to be used in as many situations as possible. For these systems use less water and deliver it more efficiently. Center pivot can and should be used for seasonal crops that can be arranged and used in this fashion. Examples include corn, carrots, cabbage, etc. Drip irrigation can be used for crops that are long term or trees. Drip irrigation can be set up for low cost to each tree to allow for more effective and targeted watering. Examples of these crops are almonds, grapes and pistachios.</p>	<p>storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).</p>
806	3	<p>Agriculture is not the only culprit, while not as large of consumers as agriculture in our state, resident consumers do have an impact. Regulation must be put in that requires more low flow devices and smarter watering of resident yards and gardens. While residents have improved over the years there is still more to be done. A tax increase should be a plan of last resort to promote smarter and more efficient usage.</p> <p>This is a big part of the problem with our water usage and it should have been addressed already. It cannot be ignored for it will lead to an over usage of our vital resources that could forever damage or destroy them. I ask for a reply on what you plan to do and updates as to how this plan is doing and when it succeeds.</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>
806	4	<p>[ATT 1: Evaluation of a Drip vs. Furrow Irrigated Cotton Production System by E.R. Norton and J.C. Silvertooth]</p> <p>Source: http://ag.arizona.edu/pubs/crops/az1224/az12245b.pdf</p>	<p>The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in the comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.</p>
807	1	<p>Before take permits can be issued under a habitat conservation plan funding must be shown to be sufficient for all proposed activities, and all financial contributors and planned allocations of funds must be identified. You should be very skeptical of any Implementing Agreement that BDCP planners eventually submit given the fact that they have been unable to give the public a reasonable amount of time to evaluate the funding proposal before the close of the EIR/EIS comment period.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 5 regarding BDCP funding. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA’s requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5.</p> <p>Please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A 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.</p> <p>From December 13, 2013 through July 29, 2014, all incoming correspondence was considered a formal comment on the Draft Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) and associated Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS). All formal comments must be processed by the State and Federal lead agencies. Public comments submitted during the official public comment period, December 13, 2013 through July 29, 2014, will be made available to the public upon the release of the Final EIR/EIS. The Final EIR/EIS will include all comments received during the official comment period and responses to substantive comments.</p> <p>This is consistent with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA Guidelines §15088) and the National Environmental Policy Act (Council on Environmental Quality § 1503.4) and policies held by all lead agencies governing the implementation of CEQA and NEPA.</p>
807	2	<p>The state and federal water contractors argue that the twin tunnels should be built because they have spent a quarter of a billion dollars on producing a Bay Delta Conservation Plan draft and environmental documents including paying millions of dollars to consultants, holding years of meetings and making dozens of presentations. However, they admit that the engineering for the actual tunnels is only 10% complete. This provides a poor basis for</p>	<p>The project would provide an average of 4.7 to 5.6 million acre-feet of water supply in a year (one acre-foot is about as much water as two California households use each year). This “Early Long Term” estimate is for the year 2025 and is about the same amount of water exported through the Delta right now. Water operations would vary depending on the hydrologic conditions (e.g., water year type, actual Sacramento River flows, fish presence), but would always include a required level of Sacramento River flow passing the</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>estimating the cost of building the twin tunnels that are the centerpiece of this habitat conservation plan.</p> <p>It is therefore not surprising that urban and agricultural users that would be the beneficiaries of BDCP are balking at paying for these tunnels that cannot guarantee them more water. Now that the whole state sees the effect of prolonged drought, it is obvious to users that the tunnels could not even guarantee a more reliable supply of less water, even if water quality protections for fish and people are suspended.</p> <p>Metropolitan Water District (MWD) member agencies in Southern California do not have take on pay contracts; some are looking for their own water supply alternative, and could opt out of taking State Water Project, making MWD unable to meet its financial obligations. Similar agriculture users in the San Joaquin Valley have made it clear that they will not be able to afford the cost of water delivery by the tunnels. If contractors cannot meet their financial obligations for the project once it is built, taxpayers will end up paying.</p>	<p>intakes before water could be diverted. Under all conditions, operational criteria require gradual ramping up of diversions and do not interfere with major river flows. Analysis of the water supply reliability benefits and estimated annual water deliveries of BDCP are included in Chapter 9. The full range of operational criteria by water year type can be found in Chapter 3: Conservation Strategy, Section 3.4 and the corresponding appendices/tables of the public Draft BDCP. In addition, Chapter 5: Effects Analysis and associated tables, which provide a comparison of alternatives and anticipated water deliveries.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 5 for a discussion on funding mechanisms for the project.</p>
807	3	<p>As far as funding the actual habitat restoration portion of the plan, the water contractors have redefined ecosystem work as a public benefit and are counting on federal assistance and bond funding to pay for it. But there is absolutely no guarantee that Californians will approve a water bond this year or in the future, or that any bond they do approve will include funding for BDCP. Similarly, there is no guarantee the federal government will come up with the \$3.5 billion that BDCP is counting on from that source.</p> <p>No one wants to pay for the ill-conceived infrastructure project as I encourage the fisheries agencies to reuse to issue permits that would enable it to go forward.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 5 for a discussion of project funding. Numerous comments were received that focused on various elements of the BDCP. Where comments raised issues as to whether the BDCP and other HCP/NCCP alternatives in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS were potentially feasible and could function as an alternative for purposes of meeting CEQA and NEPA's requirements to analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project (e.g., issues regarding the BDCP Effects Analysis or financial feasibility), responses are presented generally in Master Response 5.</p>
808	1	<p>I am writing to register my concern that the tunnels will have many negative consequences. I have been a Stockton resident since 1970 and have family in Clarksburg with 3 generations of farming the Delta. There is inherent environmental negative impact for Delta farmers.</p> <p>The impacts are listed in Chapter 13; Table 31-1. BDCP violates the intent of the 2009 reform legislation to protect the Delta as place.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 31 regarding the BDCP and compliance with applicable Delta Reform Act requirements.</p> <p>"Delta as a Place" is not a specific topic area covered by the DEIR/EIS analysis. The DEIR/EIS nonetheless addresses many of the concerns raised by the Delta Stewardship Council staff by virtue of the analysis required by CEQA and NEPA. Please see Master Response 24 for a discussion of this issue.</p>
808	2	<p>There are too many unknowns about all environmental impacts. The EIR and EIS will not satisfy state and federal laws. Therefore, the tunnels will not be able to be built.</p>	<p>The proposed project is a joint EIR/EIS prepared in compliance with the requirements of CEQA and NEPA. Before the selection and approval of an alternative considered, the Lead Agencies must comply with the necessary state and federal environmental review requirements. This document, along with the BDCP Draft EIR/EIS, and the RDEIR/SDEIS are intended to provide sufficient CEQA and NEPA support for approval of the proposed project or any of the action alternatives for either compliance strategy. As implementation of the proposed project or any of the action alternatives will require permits and approvals from public agencies other than the Lead Agencies, the CEQA and NEPA documents are prepared to support the various public agency permit approvals and other discretionary decisions.</p>
808	3	<p>Public comments will be made on a plan for which there is no financing commitment.</p> <p>Let us start over and have water storage, desalination, etc.</p>	<p>The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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> <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 water conservation. Please see Master Response 37 regarding water storage. Finally, please see Master Response 5 regarding funding of the proposed project.</p>
810	1	<p>The proposed tunnels have already been rejected by voters in 1982, and similar tunnel projects in Santa Barbara County have provided little benefit to citizens; whereas the present drought precludes the wisdom of transporting water thus, to nonessential purposes; the latter themselves precluded by the present extent of environmental pollution.</p> <p>Furthermore, the disruption of social infrastructure and the exhaustion of resources to no achievement, occasioned by these tunnels, make the project far less advisable.</p>	<p>The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. For points raised by the commenter, refer to the following Master Responses: 3 (Purpose and Need), 36 (Peripheral Canal), 5 (Overview of Restoration and Enhancement Activities), 4 (Tunnel Alternative), and 34 (Beneficial Use of Water). Chapter 16 of the Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A (Socioeconomics) identifies the unique features of the Delta and describes the potential effects on Delta communities. Chapter 20 of the Draft EIS/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A examine public services and utilities and the project’s effects.</p>
811	1	<p>As far as I can tell, this project is backed by, and designed primarily to benefit, large corporate enterprises engaged in fracking and in growing water-intensive crops mostly for export.</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. 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 designed 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>
812	1	<p>This is a continuation of cronyism and decision making that actively excludes voters. That is simply wrong.</p>	<p>This comment is on the project decision-making process. No comments on the content of the EIR/EIS or the environmental review process are presented and no additional response is required.</p>
814	1	<p>The cost of this project is a sham of calculated fraud on real tax and ratepayers. Water, a public resource is being given away to for-profit companies who are wasteful and antiquated in farming practices.</p> <p>The price tag for giving away this public property acquired with public dollars to the private sector to wastefully use is double the announced cost due to the private for-profit financing of public bonds to benefit the Wall Street scammers who have tagged LA and other public government entities with finance swaps which have destroyed those cities projects well into the future. So your multi-billion dollar project has a double whammy for Californians.</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. Please see Master Response 5 regarding the cost estimate and how bond interest is accounted for in the cost estimate.</p>
814	2	<p>Our water is precious and will become increasingly scarce. By providing a cheap and irreplaceable good at a giveaway price it encourages rapid depletion. Farms are already lowering the water table at rates which will completely deplete groundwater in less than 20 years. This does not mean that they will slow their pace in pursuit of profits: they will</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		escalate and take what they can get. When gone, the system of tunnels will guarantee they maintain their ability to blackjack Californians to continue their squandering under duress of losing jobs, food and water!	
814	3	It cannot be understated that the corporate welfare represented by giving away H2O to people who denounce [the] government, who decry socialism but do not pay their full share of contributing to this society, cannot be less than travesty.	Please refer to Master Response 26 regarding changes in Delta exports.
814	4	Once an environment has been destroyed, it is lost forever. Forever! Wiping out species of frogs, fish, birds and mammals may seem inconsequential but those critters occupy spaces which determine our very survival. Without the smelt we lose our water purification systems in the flora which thrives where those fish swim. We lose the food system those forage fish underpin. In a thing called trophic cascade, the collapse of integral components devastate place where humans live. (E.g., you kill off bees with poisons, we lose food for populations and, in 20 years, there will not be enough food to feed our state.)	Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California Water Fix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. The overall comment (i.e., that the BDCP is potentially a planetary issue) does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS or the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS. Developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state ESAs, the California WaterFix 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.
814	5	The big picture is a big deal and you need to get it. Once a decision to make vulnerable supplies of life sustaining water is made, the evil of the ramifications are irreversible. Only a moron can do what you are proposing. So, do not. No matter what, I am voting for your opponent! Facebook is going to pass that around and network a real election issue out of your foolishness, Jerry.	The plan proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which ecological goals and objectives would be fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented proposed project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years.
815	1	It is time for big agriculture to take major steps to become more sustainable in California. We have got to start living within our means. There is no excuse for destroying critical ecosystems just so a few can profit by growing and exporting water-intensive crops in the desert (San Joaquin Valley). Many of the jobs provided by big agriculture are for less-than-minimum wage migratory workers.	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. 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. Socioeconomic effects, including impacts on agricultural employment, are described in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the EIR/EIS.
815	2	We live in Tulare County, the second-largest agricultural county in the nation and one of the nation's very poorest counties, with terrible air quality (often the nation's worst), awful health problems, contaminated public water supplies that communities cannot drink or bathe in, gangs, drop-outs, and often poor public services and very poor infrastructure, except for the massive networks of canals carrying huge amounts of imported water past our own bone-dry rivers and ever-multiplying and ever-deeper-drilled wells that are taking all our groundwater as well. Clearly, we cannot go on like this. We cannot keep robbing Peter to pay Paul, and we cannot keep robbing our future generations. The last thing we need is fracking, with its horrendous waste and contamination of water supplies. There are so many alternative sources of energy, but there is no replacement for clean, abundant fresh water.	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. Please see Master Response 34. 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, nor does the proposed project 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, or between water transfer sellers and buyers. Beneficial uses are designated by the State Water Resources Control Board.
815	3	No on moving rivers to water the desert! Move the farms to where the rivers are, or grow crops with low water needs. Reduce, re-use, recycle. Stop the endless waste at gigantic and	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). 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

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		never-ending expense to the taxpayers for the benefit of the corporate few.	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 or large agribusinesses. Appendix 3A of the Draft EIR/EIS describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered. Appendix 1B discusses the potential for more water storage and Appendix 1C describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. Refer to Master Response 4 on the selection of alternatives and Master Response 6 (Demand Management).
816	1	<p>Citizens are already paying hundreds of times the rate that agriculture or big oil do. In drought years--all must tighten our water use.</p> <p>Tough times means all users must do their share to conserve our limited 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>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>
816	2	No -- to increases of water rates by the people -- and keep corporations from robbing the people of their water.	<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 costs and funding is provided in Chapter 8 of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP, 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.</p> <p>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>
817	1	Please dump this plan immediately. It puts the greed of frackers and big agriculture before the rights and needs of the 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>The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Additionally, State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to stipulated beneficial uses including: agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses such as fish protection flows. Fracking presumably could be an "industrial" use of water. As of the present, hydraulic fracturing is a lawful use of water, as state law generally permits. (California Public Resources Code, § 3106[b].) Finally, the project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
817	2	<p>Read Vandana Shiva on small-scale farming, embrace the transition movement and start moving to a smarter water policy where family farms are the order of the day, produce is grown that is either suitable for our arid climate or in greenhouses where the water can be efficiently recycled and the use of pesticides kept to a minimum.</p> <p>Small farms are the wave of the future. Already, using between 20 & 25% of the world's farmland, they are feeding the entire world:</p> <p>http://www.permaculture.co.uk/news/0406145066/small-farmers-are-feeding-world-less-land</p> <p>Invest in clean energy. That will create jobs - well-paying careers, help reduce global warming and not devastate our land, air and water the way that fracking will do. Green energy is sustainable.</p>	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
817	3	<p>The advocates of fracking are in it for short term profits and look to exports to make more money, faster. Who will clean up their spills?</p> <p>Who will replace the animal species they destroy? How will we reclaim the water they waste? What will their infrastructure be used for in ten or twenty years?</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>For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
817	4	<p>The tunnels project will be a disaster on many levels. Do not waste tax dollars, do not impose unfair costs on the citizens of Los Angeles.</p> <p>Stop now!</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>
818	1	<p>As I travel around the area I see increasing numbers of signs indicating opposition from farmers. If the farming community does not want this project then neither do I. They are too important to us to ignore.</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>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			For more information regarding agricultural impacts and mitigation please see Master Response 18.
819	1	I oppose BDCP for the reasons listed below, and I also question its necessity. I see a lot of exposed canals as I drive down Interstate 5. How much water is lost to evaporation? How much could be saved by shading it with solar panels? How much could be saved by better irrigation methods? By repairing city water mains to prevent leakage? BDCP will cost money. Could it be better spent on water-saving methods?	<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 BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, FEIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, FEIR/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>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.</p> <p>In general, cities and other local government entities supplying water to customers control their own delivery infrastructure, and are responsible for dealing with maintenance issues such as leaks. Such repairs are beyond the scope of the proposed project, and are not the responsibility of the State and Federal Governments.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed and Master Response 6 regarding demand management.</p>
820	1	<p>Endless greed from economy and helping authorities has to stop the destruction to the environment and living creatures by applying strongest justice to the responsible.</p> <p>Demand all initiators acting irresponsibly to pay redemption to future generations!</p> <p>People need to vote authorities acting irresponsibly to future generations out of their occupations once and for 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 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.</p>
821	1	I am writing from the perspective of a 68-year old observer of the rivers of Northern California. As a child, the Navarro still had a healthy population of fish, but in the last 30 years, the Navarro has gone from a compromised river to one in severe danger with only a handful of endangered Coho and some steelhead left to struggle in receding or no water. Our other Northern California rivers are no different. To take yet more water out is unthinkable if you care about future generations.	<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, 4A, includes operational criteria intended to minimize and avoid effects on fish. Please see Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Resources, EIR/EIS for more information on impacts to fish species.</p>
822	1	Too many people in Southern California already entitled to green lawns at the expense of the environment. Golf courses in Southern California can learn to act responsibly, use the intelligence God gave them, and find another way to handle their fairways.	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
			No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. For more information regarding changes in exports please see Master Response 26. For more information regarding beneficial use of water please see Master Response 34. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.
823	1	Damage to the Delta is not the whole story about the harm that would be done by the peripheral tunnels. Northern California is also suffering from drought and does not have surplus water to send south. Even without drought, dams on the Sacramento River and its tributaries, diversion of Trinity River water to the Sacramento, and diversion of Eel River water to the Russian River have already done tremendous damage to freshwater supplies, agriculture, and, obviously and well-documented, fisheries in the northern counties of the state. In California, the old Western adage that water flows from need toward money and political power is all too obvious.	<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 described in Section 5.1.1.1 of Chapter 5, Water Supply, precipitation and river flows in California are highly variable. 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. 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>
824	1	At some point you control density by saying you are beyond your resources. Well, we are. No more pipelines. People have to migrate where they find resources. They have for eons. Those that will not cause water wars. Also eons old.	<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>How population and development are managed are topics beyond the scope of this project. The Lead Agencies do not have land use/zoning authority. 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.</p>
825	1	We are destroying our planet and its life at an alarming rate. This must stop if we are to survive. This project does nothing to preserve 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>
826	1	Here on the California north coast, the rivers are already low and it is only June. Normally by now, we have lots of rain but it has not rained here in over a month! I am concerned about the fall salmon spawning without water in our local rivers!	<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 described in Section 5.1.1.1 of Chapter 5, Water Supply, precipitation and river flows in California are highly variable. The action alternatives could only change the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with 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. The action alternatives would not result in changes to flow patterns in the north coast rivers.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
827	1	<p>Also remember, that Dr. Jerry Meral, said at the Winnemem Wintu Village, in Redding, CA "The BDCP was never about saving the Delta, the Delta cannot be saved."</p> <p>I believe and many others do to, that it is about watering desert lands in the Western San Joaquin Valley. The lands are hard pan and poisoned with selenium. It is marginal land that should never been put into production.</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>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. 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--refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need). Additionally, the proposed project does not include any changes in water service areas or water distribution in export areas. For the selenium analysis, see Section 8.3.1.7 (Constituent-Specific Considerations Use in the Assessment) in Appendix A Chapter 8 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. This chapter (i.e., Section 8.2.3.15) describes selenium criteria promulgated by the State Water Resources Control Board and San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board for all of San Francisco Bay and the portions of the Delta waters in North San Francisco Bay, including portions of the Delta, and Suisun Bay, Carquinez Strait, San Pablo Bay, and the Central San Francisco Bay. In addition, EPA's Action Plan for Water Quality Challenges in the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Estuary requires new criteria for site-specific levels of selenium to protect aquatic and terrestrial species dependent on the aquatic habitats of the Bay Delta Estuary. This new criteria could be more stringent than the existing selenium water quality criteria and may require actions that would decrease allowable concentrations of selenium in surface waters, as well as set allowable levels of selenium in the tissue of fish and wildlife. Applicable selenium objectives for water in the affected environment are summarized in Table 8-54, and selected benchmarks for assessment of selenium in whole- body fish, bird eggs, and fish fillets are presented in Table 8-55 in Appendix A Chapter 8 Water Quality of the RDEIR/SDEIS; refer to Master Response 14 (Selenium) as well.</p>
828	1	<p>This is a classic case of Borrowing from Peter to pay Paul." All of California is suffering from drought. All you will be doing is making conditions worse in the north.</p> <p>There are many other, better solutions, but all of them will have to be used together. Wastewater reclamation. Storm water storage. More efficient irrigation systems in the Central Valley. Above all, no more water going 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>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> <p>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,</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
829	1	This idea is exactly contrary to a sensible water solution for our state. It prioritizes central valley farming to the detriment of everyone else in the state. The costs are mind-boggling. The destruction it will cause is permanent. Water shortages are not being addressed in a meaningful way. The central valley is not the only distressed water user in the state. Please stop 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 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). 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 large agribusinesses. Appendix 3A of the Draft EIR/EIS describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered. Appendix 1B discusses the potential for more water storage and Appendix 1C describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. Refer to Master Response 4 on the selection of alternatives and Master Response 6 (Demand Management). Regarding funding and costs, see BDCP Chapter 8, cost-benefit analysis on the BDCP website, and Master Response 5. The environmental documentation and project approval will be acted upon by the decision makers from each lead agency at the conclusion of the environmental documentation for both CEQA and NEPA.</p>
830	1	As proposed, the conservation plan is flawed and should be abandoned or revised to reduce exports that take water out of rivers, it should instead prioritize Delta recovery, and improve water conservation, recycling and storm water capture measures. These measures should always be the first place to start when dealing with water scarcity and, given that ongoing droughts are predicted for California, they are the only reasonable options for water in California and the only real hope for 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 estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p> <p>Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, FEIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, FEIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, FEIR/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>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed and Master Response 6 regarding demand management.</p>
830	2	Spending billions of dollars to drain and destroy the Delta and all the species that inhabit it is nothing short of insane and seems to be motivated by big agriculture interests with little regard for residents and small water users and zero regard for other species.	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 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). Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California Water Fix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state ESAs, the California WaterFix 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

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Refer to Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.
831	1	Stop this rip off rotten ill-conceived dirty deal now! Just another stupid water wars grab like always Central and Southern California trying to steal water resources from Northern California rivers and fish, farmers and rural communities already under long sieges of water diversions to the south and fighting to restore waters stolen so all the salmon are going extinct so corporate farmer can embezzle the north for big agribusiness profits! What a rat's nest mess. Governor Brown is insane and unfit for public service!	<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 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. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. For other points raised by the commenter, refer to the following Master Responses: 3 (Purpose and Need), 5 (Conservation Measure 1 as a CM, Overview of Restoration and Enhancement Activities), 4 (Tunnel Alternative), and 34 (Beneficial Use of Water). The discussion of community character can be found in Chapter 16 of the Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A (Socioeconomics), which identifies the unique features of the Delta and describes the potential effects on Delta communities. 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>
832	1	For the following reasons and more, the so-called Bay Delta Conservation plan is about the dumbest idea I have heard. There is no possible way that removing large quantities of water from the through-Delta flow will benefit fish and wildlife. I see it as a blatant attempt by such entities as the always- greedy Westlands Water District to grab more of Northern California's water for marginal crops in marginal farmland. It should also be noted that in earthquake prone California, large underground pipelines are disasters waiting to happen. This proposal is no exception. Please reject this needless wasteful squandering of my taxpayer dollars.	<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 do not have land use planning authority (e.g., controlling what crops should be planted). The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. See also Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need). The plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Although the 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. Refer to RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, Impact AG-1 and Impact AG-2 and their associated mitigation for impacts to Delta farmland. Chapter 9 of the Draft EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS present the project's impacts to/from geology and seismicity and concluded that the Delta tunnels can be designed to withstand anticipated seismic loads. Design-level geotechnical studies would be conducted to assess site-specific hazards and appropriate mitigation. Impacts GEO- 1 and GEO-7 discuss possible loss or damage from seismic activity during construction and operation of water conveyance features. For information on tunnel design, see the 2013 Conceptual Engineering Report. Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, of the Draft EIR/EIS discuss potential consequences of an earthquake to exports; also refer to Master Response 16 (Seismic Activity). Rates charged to water users by individual water agencies receiving SWP or CVP supplies are based on the independent rate-setting policies of those agencies. The project would not affect how agencies distribute water supply costs among their water customers. Refer to Master Response 5 for costs and funding of the project. 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.</p>
833	1	Altogether, a full misuse of the projected 67 billion dollars!	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. Please see Master Response 5 regarding the adequacy of the cost estimates for this project.</p>
833	2	<p>The conservation plan should reduce exports that take water out of rivers, prioritize Delta recovery, and improve water conservation measures.</p>	<p>The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the RDEIR/SDEIS 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the Proposed Project would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p> <p>Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, FEIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, FEIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, FEIR/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>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed and Master Response 6 regarding demand management.</p>
833	3	<p>As a 3rd generation Northern Californian Grandmother, with 5th generation California grandchildren, this state is sacred.</p> <p>Just as a child who broke a leg from riding a broken bicycle needs to understand that a Band-Aid will not fix that bone, we need to equally focus on fixing that bike--our current water usage practices--to prevent future damage.</p> <p>As Albert Einstein stated, "No problem can be solved from the same level of consciousness that created it."</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S documentation were raised.</p>
834	1	<p>Try building a water pipeline from Washington State or Colorado. Far cheaper.</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>
835	1	<p>A disaster in the making!</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>
835	2	<p>Why not make huge reservoirs to collect rainwater for the agricultural businesses and just forget the fracking period? We cannot afford to waste water in such an environmentally disastrous way. It is time to get away from fossil fuels and to use the sun and wind for our energy. Insist all new buildings from this day forward have solar panels on their roofs, and get wind turbine designs that do not kill birds.</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the or EIR/EIS.</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. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>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>
836	1	Oil companies want more water for fracking, which contaminates fresh water with toxic chemicals. Big agriculture wants to continue growing water-intensive crops like pistachios and almonds in the desert, mostly to export. These companies support the tunnels as long as they are guaranteed massive amounts of water.	<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 corporations. In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority over such entities. Refer to Master Responses Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water). 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 project 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>
836	2	These tunnels could cost us over \$67 billion and would force higher water bills through much of California. At a time when Californians are becoming more efficient and using less water, big agriculture and big oil are doing the opposite. And beyond the extraordinary expense, the twin tunnels would siphon necessary funding away from real, necessary water solutions, like investment in local water, groundwater cleanup and stormwater capture.	<p>The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the project would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State. For more information on funding and costs, see BDCP Chapter 8, cost-benefit analysis on the project website, and Master Response 5. Appendix 3A of the Draft EIR/EIS describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered. Appendix 1B of the Draft 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 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.</p>
837	1	The big urban districts will survive with sustainable urban planning, rainwater collection, better grey water utilization, and of course more conservation. Most rural Californians' water needs would be secure if you would do something about the groundwater overdraft and our archaic surface water rights. It is big oil, big agribusiness and big development that are the real backers for your inane water projects. They are the same small fraction of Californians who already control up to 80% of the State's fresh water. If you want to leave a	<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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		bigger water legacy than your Dad's, then use your emergency power as Governor of California to restore fresh water's status as a publicly owned resource.	<p>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.</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 Master Response 5 for more information on funding.</p>
838	1	Please discontinue the theft of Northern California to serve the over populated Southern California. Here is a cheaper solution and could benefit all of California for generations to come. Start building desalination plants! Allocate the funding for continued Research & Development. Refining this technology, this resource is unlimited.	<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. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, of the EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. Please also refer to the following: 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). 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. Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP component.</p>
839	1	Large corporate farms and Southern California cities should not be allowed to divert even more water from the Sacramento and San Joaquin Delta while the fish are struggling and all Californians are being asked to pay for the improvements. Increased diversion rates will likely harm the native fish species that reside in or migrate through the Delta. New screens will likely harm the salmon populations in the Sacramento River. If the water supply system needs to be improved it should not be done with increases in diversion rates to the South. Any new infrastructure, including the tunnels, and restoration of the Delta habitats to protect native fish, should be paid for by those who receive the water.	<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, 4A, includes operational criteria to avoid and minimize effects on fish. The proposed NDD facility will include state-of-the-art screens that will be designed based on a number of field and laboratory studies that would be implemented prior to completion of their design. Their location in the river, mesh size, and the approach and sweeping velocity requirements will minimize the potential for entrainment and impingement. The use of the south Delta facilities will be substantially reduced. All of the new infrastructure and associated mitigation costs will be paid by the public water agencies who will receive water using the new facilities.</p>
840	1	I feel sure that it would be cheaper to give Central Valley farmers market-rate loans to install efficient irrigation systems than to build these tunnels. We give enough subsidies to these farmers already and they do many inefficient things as a result. We need reform, not 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>The commenter's opposition to the project is acknowledged. 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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			industry.
841	1	It makes no sense to create a desert in order to water a desert. Here in the North state, we are managing our water resources carefully in order to balance the needs of nature, agriculture, and urban users. If the amounts of water the tunnel project is designed to move are taken from our surface water, we will have to pump our groundwater aquifer. The result will be catastrophic for our native oak and sycamore trees. It will likely break the water tension that is essential to recharge the aquifer. What a catastrophe.	<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 alternative, the California WaterFix Project, aims to allow the federal and state water projects to deliver more reliable water supplies, in a way less harmful to fish. It would not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Such 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. For other points raised by the commenter, see Master Responses: Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 5 (Conservation Measure 1 as a CM, Overview of Restoration and Enhancement Activities), Master Response 4 (Tunnel Alternative), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water) and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply). With regards to groundwater aquifers, refer to the analyses done in the Draft EIR/EIS (Chapter 7) and in the RDEIR/SDEIS (Sections 3 and 5; Appendix A [Chapter 7]).</p>
841	2	The transfer of North state water will have wide-ranging and permanent negative impacts.	The commenter raises an issue regarding water transfer related to the BDCP. For additional information about water transfers and their potential impacts, please refer to Master Response 43 (Water Transfers) and the revised discussion in the RDEIR/SEIS documentation: Appendix A (Chapter 5-Water Supply, starting on page 5-15, i.e., "Impact WS-3: Effects of Water Transfers on Water Supply") and Section 4 (New Alternatives).
842	1	<p>Coal for electric power natural gas cheap cheap cheap for whom?</p> <p>Fracking -- if we simply stop arguing and look at the damage might we see our future is now all that is left to lose?</p> <p>Fracking 350.org argue this true science, Congress! Governor Brown, what happen to the ole hippy in you?</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>
843	1	Stop sending out water to wasteful agriculture. I drove through the Central Valley last month and was absolutely shocked to see air-sprayed irrigation going on in the middle of the day, in 90 degree heat with about 30 miles per hour of wind! I could not believe it! Only half of that water makes it to the ground. The rest simply evaporates. And since agriculture uses about 38% of all the water in the state, they need to get their act together! Make them install drip irrigation, or at least water their damned crops at night.	<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>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
844	1	<p>This project will cost billions of dollars and have disastrous consequences for our natural water systems.</p> <p>Stop messing with our fish and clean water.</p> <p>No to tunnels!</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 more information regarding cost of the proposed project.</p> <p>The Cumulative Impact Analyses that was written for the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS has been revised to include the impacts associated with the new proposed project alternatives and also updates past analyses. Environmental Commitments are to minimize effects to the Delta and its inhabitants and mitigate for loss of habitat to the ecosystem and its species. For more information please see Section 5 Revisions to Cumulative Impact Analyses, Appendix A Chapter 11 Fish and Aquatic Resources, Appendix A Chapter 12 Terrestrial Biological Resources, and Appendix 3B Environmental Commitments, AMMs, and CMs of the RDEIR/SDEIS.</p>
845	1	<p>The rich simply need no more welfare and this is a giveaway to them and them alone.</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>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 costs and funding is provided in Chapter 8 of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP, 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.</p> <p>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>
846	1	<p>I am particularly distressed that the water would be used by the oil industry for fracking. We should not have fracking in this State. We should go to 100% renewable energy. We should use the money to develop storage options for renewable energy.</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 laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to stipulated beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows. Fracking -- or "hydraulic fracturing" -- presumably could be an "industrial" use of water. As of the present, hydraulic fracturing is a lawful use of water, as state law generally permits oil and gas operators to engage in "the injection of air, gas, water, or other fluids into the productive strata, the application of pressure heat or other means for the reduction of viscosity of the hydrocarbons, the supplying of additional motive force, or the creating of enlarged or new channels for the underground movement of hydrocarbons into production wells[.]" (Cal. Pub. Resources Code, § 3106[b].)</p> <p>For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
847	1	<p>Well, if there is a way to redirect taxpayer's dollars to foot the bill for private corporate development, Californians led by Jerry Brown cannot be beat. Or can they?</p> <p>As long as profits can be made strong-arming the taxpayer, whether it is building new tunnels that are water-wasteful and backward-thinking, or pump-and-pollute projects from the oil industry, the unregulated out-of-control private corporations that operate out of Sacramento's pocket will drive the rest of us to the poorhouse.</p> <p>What is next -- an IQ quota or job-slot lottery to determine which of us live and which die? California cannot afford this kind of crap any longer. We grow crops that do not belong in a drought state. We use watering technologies that are wasteful instead of using something like what Israel uses for their crops.</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 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 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>
847	2	Jerry Brown was there for the first flim-flam scam and he is at it again.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
848	1	<p>There seem to be a lot of unanswered questions about the project itself and its impact on the land and people in the region and the CA tax payer in general. It is wrong to build first and ask questions later and actually ultimately depend on the CA taxpayer to foot the bill. It seems some more prep work needs to be done, such as closing law loopholes which now exist whereby some individuals are selling subsidized water to the highest bidder.</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>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. Please see Master Response 5 for information on funding of the project.</p>
849	1	Your job is to enhance the lives of Californians; this action does not do that. We are doing our bit to conserve water. You are paid by the taxpayers 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 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. Please see Master Response 3 for more information on the purpose and need for the project. 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>
850	1	<p>The Native American, Sports, and Commercial fishing are being sacrificed to inefficient big agribusiness. This has happened over and over again. It needs to stop. For instance, why is cotton being grown in California with cheap water? Why is selenium-saturated soil in production? Why not make big agribusiness conserve? How many more vineyards are being allowed to start up? There are many more alternatives to try before making me subsidize big agribusiness with my money.</p> <p>Governor Brown, you should take a salmon/steelhead fishing trip on the Trinity and Klamath rivers. And you should go see for yourself what is happening to the Scott and Salmon Rivers for the sake of alfalfa.</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>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
851	1	One better way to distribute California’s increasingly over-subscribed water: metering of big agriculture’s water use, with concomitant adjustment of fees so that big agriculture pays its fair share of water.	<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>
851	2	One better way to distribute California’s increasingly over-subscribed water: overhauling California’s outdated and unfair water laws to reflect our actual precipitation budget and the probability that climate change is in the process of decreasing that budget drastically.	Revising California’s water law is not considered in the project because it would not be consistent with this EIR’s project objectives, as described in Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need, in the EIR/EIS. Revising California water law cannot be considered by the federal government agencies.
852	1	By far more important than all that cost....it will destroy the largest estuary in the western hemisphere. It will have immeasurable impacts to the Sacramento River fish and salmon. The Winnemem Wintu Tribe strongly opposes this destructive water plan...California should be feeding the world salmon as we are one of only four USA states on the Pacific Coast who can and have an obligation to do so.	<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 BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A 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 evaluation of the preferred alternative, 4A, shows that the impacts of the operations on salmon are less than significant. Additionally, no CEQA or NEPA decisions will be made until ESA consultation on all of the listed species that could be affected, including salmonids, is completed by NMFS and FWS.</p>
853	1	Robbing Peter to pay Paul is not a workable plan. We have serious drought in the northern part of the state which will only get worse with more water diversion. Southern and Central California need to de-silt their reservoirs (20-30% more holding capacity) and provide for more ground water catchment. Local management is always the preferred option.	<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. Refer to Master Response 45 (Purpose and Need) for more discussion on the proposed project. Contrary to the commenter’s assumption, the water supply and Delta hydrodynamic modeling conducted for the Draft EIR/EIS specifically considered and included potential future climate change and drought conditions to hydrologic and water quality variables. Refer to Master Response 19 (Climate Change and GHG); Chapter 29, Climate Change, Draft EIR/EIS and Appendix A RDEIR/SDEIS; and Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS (in Appendix A). Discussion on siltation can be found in Chapter 10 (Soils) and in Appendix A (Chapter 10) and in Section 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Appendix 3A of the Draft EIR/EIS describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered. Appendix 1B discusses the potential for more water storage and Appendix 1C describes</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply. Chapter 7 of the Draft EIR/EIS evaluates groundwater supplies and impacts, along with Appendix A (Chapter 7) and Section 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS.
853	2	Big agriculture has gone from seasonal crops to permanent crops and this is making matters far worse. As we all are growing more and more of our own food, it is time for these big agriculture interests to do their part in wise water use.	<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>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>
854	1	<p>The Natural Resources Defense Council and the Pacific Institute's recent report revealed that with better water conservation and recycling efforts California could more than close the gap between consumption and what our natural water sources provide. One main effort involving agriculture that they recommended was:</p> <p>Improving agricultural use. Water for crops is the bulk of California's water use and where most of the savings can be found. These include shifting from flood irrigation to drip and sprinklers, better irrigation scheduling, and applying less water to crops in the drought-tolerant stages of growth.</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> <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>
854	2	<p>The Natural Resources Defense Council and the Pacific Institute's recent report revealed that with better water conservation and recycling efforts California could more than close the gap between consumption and what our natural water sources provide. One main effort involving agriculture that they recommended was:</p> <p>More reuse. Water put to use once can be reused again for things like irrigation or industrial processes. The analysis found potential savings of 1.2 to 1.8 million acre-feet per year by expanding these practices, especially along coastal regions where waste water is often drained into the ocean.</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>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>
855	1	Since there has been no responsible action to protect our water from being wasted in fracking operations, there is no way I can support this project. We, the people, are working on conservation efforts every day, but big business gets rewarded for being wasteful in the worst drought in 500 years? This is beyond unacceptable. Taking water from another part of the state because certain industries cannot manage resources responsibly basically amounts to theft. Here is an idea: end fracking if you think you need more water. Maybe, if you think you are out of water, you should think long and hard about the fact that fracking is destroying the ecological viability of your region. Scientists and numerous citizens have been warning about this situation for quite some time. Consider this a wake-up call. Stealing	<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. 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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		water from other living things because you have squandered it is not a viable option and it never was.	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 designed 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).
856	1	At a time when the region of extreme drought is expanding in California, when voters and taxpayers are being asked to scale back our water use, we are appalled that the biggest water wasters are being given a free pass to continue their irresponsible and profligate use of this precious resource.	<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 main comment does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/ EIS documentation. Refer to Master Responses: Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Export), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply) for clarification on the conveyance of water from Northern California. The project would make water deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p>
857	1	This project will be diverting precious water in the midst of a serious drought. As climate change exacerbates, we will be struggling more and more to find the necessary supplies of water for all our population. Every source of this necessity of life should be fairly distributed to every appropriate consumer, not j [sic] be manipulated for the benefit of a handful of mega-industries. Once again, here is an example of a proposal aimed at profiting a small segment of the citizenry -- those with the most power. Please do not carry out the tunnel project for the Sacramento River.	<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 "a handful of mega-industries." In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. With respect to the drought, the proposed intakes would only 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. Flow criteria would be applied month by month and according to water year type. More information on the ranges of water project diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in BDCP, Chapter 3 (Conservation Strategy). The anticipated hydrologic changes due to climate change (increased temperatures and more years of critical dryness, increased water temperatures, changes in precipitation and runoff patterns, sea level rise, and tidal variations) will constrain and challenge future water management practices across the State, with or without the BDCP. 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 BDCP 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. Additionally, refer to Master Response 19 (Climate Change and GHG). Lastly, for control over the volume of water deliveries, the plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. 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>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
858	1	Redirecting the Sacramento River will also have environmental impacts that will not be reversible and will domino into bigger problems in future. Shortsighted projects like these tunnels will only serve to enrich a handful of individuals, at the expense of a huge ecosystem and the life it provides your residents.	<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>
859	1	<p>There are other concerns. Why is the money not being invested in local water infrastructure improvements at city level?</p> <p>Why is there not more money invested in education on water conservation practices?</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 3 for information regarding the purpose and need of the project.</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>
859	2	Why are we supporting big agriculture, when they are getting subsidies and the cheapest water available?	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
859	3	Is this water going towards fracking?	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. For more information regarding beneficial use of water please see Master Response 34.
859	4	The tunnels will fail us in the event of an earthquake; there is no reliability for SoCal with the tunnels.	Chapter 9 of the Draft EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS describes the geology and seismicity of the study area. From a review of the last 20 years of precast tunnel lining seismic performance histories, it can be concluded that little or no damage to precast tunnel lining was observed for major earthquakes around the world. It is anticipated that the Delta tunnels can be designed to withstand anticipated seismic loads. Design-level geotechnical studies would be conducted to assess site-specific hazards and appropriate mitigation measures would be implemented. Impact GEO- 1 and GEO-7 discusses the possibility of loss or damage resulting from strong seismic activity during construction and operation of water conveyance features. Overall, the proposed facilities would be designed and managed during and after construction to meet the safety and collapse-prevention requirements of the relevant state codes and standards listed in Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, of the RDEIR/SDEIS for the anticipated seismic loads. For specifics regarding tunnel design, see the 2013 Conceptual Engineering Report. Additionally, refer to Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, of the Draft EIR/EIS for discussion of potential consequences of an earthquake to exports under a No Action Alternative scenario and to Master Response 16 (Seismic Activity).
859	5	Stop the tunnels! This is not the legacy you should leave behind Gov. Brown.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
860	1	Quit acting like a GOP Governor and beating up the little taxpayer. You have spent enough. Make big agriculture and oil frackers pay for your folly.	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
			Please see Master Response 5 regarding funding of the project.
861	1	I am not a scientist, but even I realize that siphoning off fresh water from the Delta will cause salty water from Suisun and San Francisco Bays to encroach. The project is too big, too costly, and does not contain incentives for conservation.	<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>This comment addresses Alternative 4 (known also as the BDCP) or analysis contained within the draft BDCP Effects Analysis. Alternative 4 remains a viable alternative. For detailed responses on the primary issues being raised with regard to the BDCP or Alternative 4, as well as a discussion of the current status of the draft BDCP Effects Analysis, please see Master Response 5.</p>
861	2	The oil giants who fleece this state by not paying a severance tax also want taxpayer-subsidized water to extract natural gas through hydraulic fracturing. The limited water supplies in this state cannot supply our large population, and agribusiness, and fracking.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
861	3	I urge you to consider policies that encourage re-use and reclamation of water that is already available.	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed and Master Response 6 regarding demand management.</p>
862	1	I am seriously concerned that I, a Los Angeles resident, would take on a good deal of the burden along with my fellow Angelinos of funding tunnels to divert the Sacramento River to the Central Valley. I will not really benefit from the project, and neither will my fellow citizens; at least, not in a manner that comes close to the benefit that large agribusiness expects to receive. These businesses receive water for relatively very little money and yet expect to be subsidized even more.	<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.</p> <p>Information regarding 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. If an HCP alternative is chosen, the 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 the proposed project.</p>
862	2	<p>I am very concerned that oil corporations would benefit from this water for the purpose of fracking. Fracking should be banned in California. Clean water is more important than corporate profits.</p> <p>Californians should not have to tolerate water that can catch on fire so that corporations can have money to burn.</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. 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 designed 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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).
863	1	We are in a drought. We need water for people and wildlife, not to give preference to 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>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>
863	2	Oil companies should be forbidden to frack in California. Fracking toxifies our water and air, and also increases the risk of earthquakes.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
864	1	<p>Governor Brown, you disappoint me greatly. The drilling of tunnels to bring water from Northern CA to the Central Valley only serves the needs of the controlling oligarchy. They do not serve the people, only the needs of the rich.</p> <p>Show some cahones [sic] and do the right thing and forget this tunnel project, as well as fracking. Both ideas threaten California's water supply for years to come. Democrats hold the majority. Let us use it to get California on the right track, not onto the agenda of the right wing.</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 3 on the purpose and need for the project. 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>
865	1	This project is the typical example of short-term thinking so a few people can make big money at the expense of the public. I do not believe whatever trickles down to us is going to be worth squandering our precious water resources, which are running low anyway.	<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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).
865	2	I am extremely disappointed with Jerry Brown for not coming out against fracking and other ecological disasters like this, and I am going to take this very much into consideration when it comes to voting for him again--and my local politicians.	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.
866	1	It is simply not realistic or sustainable to grow water-intensive crops like almonds, for example, in what would otherwise be desert.	<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> <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>
866	2	I do not want our scarce water to be used for fracking, which could contaminate the soil and water for generations.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
867	1	Why would a Northern Californian want water to go down South? I might be more understanding of our Southern neighbors, but when we are on strict water ration to the point of our lawns and plants drying up in Santa Cruz and no restrictions are placed in Southern 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>The commenter is referred to Master Responses: Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), and Master Response 35 (Water Use in Southern California). In addition, the main 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.</p>
867	2	Why should big corporations who put in fields along Route 68 and 5, such as pistachio trees, cotton etc., receive water plus every other goody from the feds and the State? No more! Stop this madness that only aids corporations and forgets the citizens of California. Time to march on to Sacramento and Washington.	<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 proposed 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>The commenter's opposition to the proposed project is acknowledged.</p>
868	1	The two underlying problems are California's unsustainable population numbers/growth rates and our habits of using fresh water as if it is meant to serve only ourselves. We need smart leadership to change public attitudes toward better stewardship of our land and natural resources. Our population numbers are already too big, because we have continued	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
		to seriously disrupt and degrade our water, air, land and habitat for species other than our own. We need strong leadership for conservation in this biological hotspot that is California.	to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. 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. The Lead Agencies do not have land use/zoning authority to redirect population trends or housing trends. This issue is beyond the scope of the project.
869	1	As having worked in a public water agency for nearly 40 years as well as being a former policy setter for the San Diego County Water Authority, I find it ludicrous that the cost has risen so high when there are alternatives available to keep the cost down. However, what is most appalling to me is the fact that we are being asked to foot the bill for big business like the large agriculture who export product for massive profit and oil companies for fracking.	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. Please refer to Master Response 5 regarding costs of the project.
869	2	Common sense should tell you (what common sense there is in Sacramento) that the fracking alone takes way too much of this precious resource. But once again big money wants more money from the taxpayers so they can profit while the rest of us suffer. Enough is enough!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
870	1	Fracking is disastrous to all water supplies. Starving it of water is the best way to control it.	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. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
870	2	There are sustainable agriculture methods for efficient water use. Asking Californians to pay for corporate agriculture to have more to waste is just not acceptable.	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.
871	1	I would like to add that these types of projects should only be done to benefit the local, organic, sustainable farmers whose first priority is to nurture the land and the people -- starting with local and moving outward. I know I am not the most eloquent with my words, but I believe you understand what I am saying.	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 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.
872	1	From moonbeam to pile-o-turds in one lifetime. It is not too late to change that. It is important to support commerce, but it is also important to make sure that commerce does not [expletive deleted] the citizens of California. It is not too late to start doing that and lose the pile-o-turds reputation that you have developed lately.	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 comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
873	1	This is another obvious blatant abuse of agriculture and oil industry corporate power and political favors with lobbying influence and corruption once again. Controlling another government agency along with writing the rules for their greedy selfish interests.	<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 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>
874	1	This project wants to be yet another big rich industry grab of resources so they can waste them. Not this time! Californians are going to protect and conserve water sources, because that is the only option. Either that or lose 25 million 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>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 "another big rich industry." 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. The commenter is referred to Master Responses: Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
875	1	I mean, really, Governor Brown? Have you abandoned the environment entirely? Did you only care before for political motivations, and now secure in your incumbency you show your true ties to the purse strings of big corporations? It is time to stand up for the state and the people in it, not the corporations who wish to own it.	<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 BDCP. 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 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>
876	1	As Californians become more efficient and use less water, big agribusiness and big oil are doing the opposite. And beyond the extraordinary expense, the twin tunnels would siphon necessary funding away from real, necessary water solutions, like investment in local water, groundwater cleanup and stormwater capture.	<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 just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The proposed project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</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.</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 water conservation.</p>
877	1	<p>Indeed, we fought this battle in the defeat of the 1980s peripheral canal! Now were fighting this battle again so that our precious water can be sent to huge oil companies that hoard this water and then resell it at very inflated prices!</p> <p>This is as bad as the fracking debacle you have gotten our state into.</p> <p>Despite the long history of fracking, its poisoning of ground water supplies which are extremely limited, and justifying it all in the name of jobs. Why you wish to destroy our water supply is beyond me!</p> <p>Please reconsider and think about what we are leaving to our children!</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>A number of important improvements have been made to set the current proposal apart from the Peripheral Canal. For instance, tunnels are proposed to reduce surface impacts associated with canals. The capacity of the Proposed Project is more than 10,000 cfs smaller than the Peripheral Canal. The project as proposed allows for dual conveyance allowing through-Delta operations to continue in order to maintain in-Delta water quality. The Proposed Project would require operation of the proposed new in-Delta portions of the CVP and SWP pursuant to environmentally stringent rules under the Federal Endangered Species Act and California Endangered Species Act. Refer to Master Response 36 for more information on the differences between the proposed project and the Peripheral Canal.</p>
878	1	<p>Instead of wasting millions and millions of metric tons on dirty oil, gas, fracking etc., invest in clean solar and motion energy. Collect this free energy and feed it into the grid, fuel our vehicles, fuel our homes and business. Convert our agriculture to organic as it protects our water, air, soil, pollinators, eco systems, health and our economy.</p> <p>Organic is very profitable, and sustainable. Motion energy created by vehicles on roads, highways, freeways is free and just waiting to be captured and fed to the grid as is solar. Technology is here today, use it. Vehicles can be operated by wind resistance and solar technology available today, use it. Organic food produces more yields and profits, use and expand it. The environment protects our food supply and our climate, protect it. The people have spoken, we want clean energy, clean water, clean air, and clean soil, protection for the environment and stable climate. You have simple solutions, just do it, make the change today! There are so many bright minds in California with the capability to make this a reality, use it today, and use the technology today, organic food, solar and motion energy, protection of the environment, clean air, clean water and clean soil. Just do it today!</p> <p>Chipotle a sustainable organic restaurant trades at \$600 dollars a share, google uses solar</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>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		energy and organic food, apple and sustainability and solar energy, all the organic farmers mom and pops feed millions of people, electric cars, solar and motion energy is here today to fuel our vehicles, homes, businesses, transportation. Just do it today!	
879	1	<p>The money to fund this tunnel to nowhere should be used to increase development of local sources of new water, not diversion of existing water supply. Funding of infrastructure to capture rainwater, regenerate groundwater and protect local watersheds is making Southern California more and more independent of imported water, despite population growth.</p> <p>We do not need this.</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. 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>
880	1	<p>If you feel that you must build a massive and destructive tunnel, please build it from the East Coast and Midwest where there is currently too much water. That would make sense and the big businesses that want it should pay for that, not California citizens, many of whom are still below federal poverty level and paying dearly just to have enough water to drink and take a shower once in a while.</p> <p>It is very wrong to divert water that is needed and already being paid for by people for basic survival just to please the large corporations that support your political ambitions. If corporations feel that they are people then they should pay for water just like real people do!</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> <p>The EIR/EIS indicates that additional water contractors may become project proponents in the future (see Chapter 1, Introduction). Please refer to Master Response 5.</p>
880	2	Please consider the people (human individuals) who you are supposed to be representing; they just might be more important than big business in the long run.	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.
881	1	No water should be used for fracking, ever. We in California have lots of sun. We need solar which does not waste our precious water. Give us solar on every business, government buildings, public places, and on our own private homes. Why are you wasting what little clean water we have on destructive fracking? Protect our water.	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
			No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
882	1	It appears that except for some jobs, some are to a number of undocumented migrant workers, and none of these industries even benefit the general population of California State. Gov. Brown, is not it your job to make sure what takes place in this state benefits the majority of Californians? No-brainer?	<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 Socioeconomics ECON-2 in Chapter 16 as well as Chapter 30, section 30.3.2.1, Direct Growth Inducement in the 2013 Draft EIR and Appendix A of the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS for more information on jobs creation.</p>
883	1	We live in a desert! Stop trying to make it something else. Do you see snow on those mountains? No, you do not. Stop wasting water and start serious conservation restrictions for everyone.	<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 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. 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. 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>
884	1	<p>We, Eric and Kay Nelson, strongly oppose this extremely expensive mistake for all of California. We have lived in California all our lives, and seen bone dry regions completely unsuited for growing tree crops, for example, have enormous amounts of precious water resources poured onto them to force nuts and tree fruits to grow where cotton once grew, taking two-thirds more water to produce a crop. Wrong, wrong, wrong! The aquifer in these and other areas is being depleted at alarming rate.</p> <p>Governor, there is only so much water in California!</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>
884	2	<p>Please listen to your citizens! This misguided project for the benefit of oil companies and huge agriculture conglomerates is not wanted by the citizens of California.</p> <p>Thank you for listening to us citizens and acting responsibly in the interest of the average Californian!</p>	The BDCP/California WaterFix process has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole. 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 project 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. Please refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<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.</p>
885	1	<p>Stop fracking around and reduce the need for so much water by reevaluating crops and choosing more robust crops that use less water, capture rain water and other sources that come for free, learn to repurpose what we have and let the waters stay where they are and not add this highly questionable billion dollar project.</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 one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies needed to meet California’s overall water management needs. It is not a substitute for increased commitments to other water supply solutions, including recycling, desalination, water conservation and storage.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project. Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the or EIR/EIS. 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>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>
886	1	<p>This proposed project will decimate the Delta, an ecosystem that has already been greatly harmed by agribusiness removing vast amounts of water from it, by removing even more fresh water.</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 agribusinesses is beyond the scope of the proposed project. 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. It would not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Such 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>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
886	2	<p>Please cancel the plans for your proposed tunnels. Agribusiness needs to learn to live within limits by, among other things, not growing water-intensive crops in dry places like California and not growing anything in extremely dry areas like the western San Joaquin Valley.</p> <p>We are not willing to sacrifice our native ecosystems for agribusiness!</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 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>
887	1	<p>Stop spending our tax dollars to support industries that are enjoying the lowest tax rates in history. This is the real welfare that is rampant in our nation, and is contributing to the on-going public opposition to government.</p> <p>This project exemplifies the corruption of government from its by the people, for the people to by corporations, for corporations. What is next? Corporatizing our air?</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 refer to Master Response 5 regarding costs and funding of the project.</p>
888	1	<p>We need to focus on promoting water conservation, not large-scale use, because it will only get more and more scarce in the future.</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>The proposed project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies needed to meet California's overall water management needs. It is not a substitute for increased commitments to other water supply solutions, including recycling, desalination, water conservation and storage.</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. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
889	1	<p>We need to get real about living with less water in California, not spending gobs of taxpayer money to shuffle what water we have got around.</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 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS were raised. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding, respectively).</p>
889	2	<p>Not a drop of our water should be allocated for fracking, which will taint our limited groundwater supplies with noxious chemicals.</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
889	3	<p>The proposed tunnels will not solve our water problems; they will just relocate it ... and cost a lot of money that would be better spent elsewhere.</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>
890	1	<p>If you want to build tunnels, start east and bring water to California.</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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<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>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>
891	1	No to fracking! Cut them off at the water.	<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>
892	1	The existing aqueduct and water storage facilities should be covered to reduce evaporation and other strategies implemented to reduce the loss of water already diverted, including irresponsible use at the far end of existing pipes.	<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. Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing water use efficiency and water conservation.</p>
893	1	<p>Water is a precious resource that we have too often squandered. Let us get it right first and then proceed with solutions that encompass the needs of the many.</p> <p>We all need to understand that Mother Nature is not, and will not be, predictable. This is the constant that will challenge us today, and long into the future.</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.</p>
894	1	When will the politically and economically motivated water grab stop? We cannot continue going in this direction, forever needing to dam and channel more and more water. There are limits to natural ecosystems, and when those are compromised, failure results.	<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>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
894	2	One answer here is to support the return to traditional and sustainable agricultural methods, that focus on natural soil fertility, rather than importing of water and chemicals.	The issue of agribusinesses is beyond the scope of the proposed project. Refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Action 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 (Demand Management) and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.
896	1	<p>The price of water sold for industrial and agricultural uses does not come close to meeting the costs. The most prudent next step is to raise water prices to their actual scarcity level--including pricing for water sold to households. Then, amazing things will happen. Everyone will work, and invest, to limit their use of water.</p> <p>Until then, building a project to supply more subsidized water makes no sense whatever.</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 more information regarding costs and funding of the proposed project.</p>
897	1	Please, please read the scientific information available on long-term effects of channeling water in this manner. Throughout the world, the devastation is permanent and of far greater concern than the short-term benefits to a few.	<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 would not affect upstream water rights or Table A amounts; instead, it is designed to be a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. Future water deliveries from the federal and state water projects are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years with project implementation. Refer to Master Response 26 for possible effects to northern California. Alternative 4A, also known as California WaterFix, has been developed in response to public and agency input and is the new CEQA Preferred Alternative (see Section 4 of the RDEIR/SDEIS). RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A Chapter 6 (Surface Water) describes waters of the Sacramento River and the San Joaquin River basins, including the Delta and Suisun Marsh, directly or indirectly affected by SWP and CVP operations and environmental commitments identified in the action alternatives.</p>
898	1	<p>I am so exasperated by business taking precedent over citizens.</p> <p>Agriculture is understandable since it does feed the citizens, but we do not need more oil extraction. We need to invest in renewable energy.</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>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 oil 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> <p>The California Energy Commission (CEC) promotes energy efficiency throughout the State, supports renewable energy and public interest energy research, and plans and directs the State's responses to energy emergencies. The CEC provides one-stop permitting for new energy facilities. The CEC also regulates the State's energy operations and provides funds for a variety of technologies that would reduce GHGs (California Energy Commission 8 2009a in Chapter 21 of the Draft EIR/EIS). As DWR resources for future SWP delivery requirements, it will pursue cleaner resources to reduce SWP greenhouse gas emissions as outlined in DWR's Climate Action Plan-Phase I: Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Plan (see Chapter 22 of the</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Draft EIR/EIS, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Section 22.3.2.3, for additional details on the CAP). The 2020 portfolio (Figure 21-2 of the Draft EIR/EIS) will be comprised of a portion of the Lodi Energy Center combined cycle power plant, and new renewable energy resources.
899	1	<p>Please think about the future and consider common sense solutions like separating our sewer and storm drain systems. (Much of that infrastructure is in need of repair anyhow.) Do not create a greater problem of pollution and scarcity by allowing fracking to continue. We all know the oil companies record of cleaning up after themselves.</p> <p>Let us spend our money on projects that benefit all of us, not just a few corporations.</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>