

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
900	1	<p>You are a great governor in most respects, probably the best we have ever had.</p> <p>But propping up big corporations at the expense of the rest of Californians is doing nothing but propping up the status quo of the very system which created this economic mess... at the same time helping to destroy our environment, at the same time as letting mega corps in California continue to prevent better solutions.</p> <p>You may be doing this to keep business in California for tax reasons... but farmers are not going to move their farms and fraggers cannot move the ocean... if you give them water then make them pay for it... not anyone else... if they profit off the agriculture then raise their taxes for exporting it.</p> <p>We have few choices for a truly great Governor... you are basically it.</p> <p>Please do not tarnish your record of being progressive and representing the majority of voters by catering to any corporation that has only its own self interests at heart.</p> <p>California needs water.. Not polluted oceans and communities... We need water, not crops being sold elsewhere with profits going to the ones who took their water from us when we needed it.</p> <p>The status quo is broken... We need innovation. You are our only hope.</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. Please see Master Response 3 for information on the purpose and need for the proposed 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>
901	1	<p>Fracking wastes enormous amounts of water that can never be reclaimed due to the poisons it uses.</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>
902	1	<p>Are you people really [expletive deleted] serious? Let's stop this crazy train.</p> <p>California needs a new direction, and this is not the solution. We should be striving for a zero impact society where we leave no carbon footprint and natural resources are replenished instead of being squandered in the name of profits!</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 preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A. The 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>
903	1	<p>Having the corporate recipients to pay their fair share is only just, and if that issue is not addressed properly, then the answer is not no, but [expletive deleted] no!</p> <p>Furthermore, when was the decision made to betray the California voter, constituent ratepayer and taxpayer by hoping you would get this imbroglia pushed through behind our back?</p> <p>Another slip up like this, and the voters will retaliate by voting in Neel Kashkari. Then our problem will really begin when a Goldman Sachs devotee gets control of our state resources.</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>For more information regarding funding of the proposed project please see Master Response 5.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
904	1	<p>California's history has been shaped, at least in part, by its water resources. The Byzantine network of water deals and infrastructure----much of it a triumph of engineering and influence over rational water consumption---has us redirecting, pumping, and depleting our natural river networks for the sake of over-development and agriculture on a massive scale. California cannot be successful if that success is unsustainable, draining a critical resource to generate profit. Moreover, the water is potentially available for use in fracking, demonstrably one of the most detrimental practices to ground water and the environment to date. We cannot afford this approach in any sense of the word.</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. 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>
905	1	<p>What will become of the toxic waste produced from the oil industry, will it truly just go away or find its way into our aquifers?</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>More than two-thirds of the residents of the state and more than two million acres of highly productive farm land receive water exported from the Delta watershed. The proposed project aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. However, the project proponents have no authority to designate what water is used for.</p> <p>An environmental commitment has been developed that would provide a mechanism for implementing stormwater treatment measures that would result in decreased discharge of contaminants to the Delta, which is intended to reduce the amount of pollution in stormwater runoff entering Delta waterways. Please refer to Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, in Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS.</p> <p>Chapter 8, Water Quality, RDEIR/SDEIS takes into consideration existing discharges from municipal facilities in its assessment of water quality impacts related to implementation of the proposed project.</p> <p>One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board.</p> <p>The proposed project Lead Agencies have no power to impose penalties on individual water users. DWR and Reclamation have contracts with various entities, some of which sell water to water retailers, who have individual policies and programs to motivate ratepayers to conserve water. Different districts have the right to take different approaches depending on their individual circumstances.</p> <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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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>The state Department of Conservation is currently working on fracking regulations and rules passed by the Legislature have been sent to the governor. 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. The Department of Conservation estimates that statewide, about 270 acre-feet of water per year is used for hydraulic fracture stimulation activities. For comparison’s sake, roughly 5.2 million acre-feet of water a year have been diverted from the Delta, on average, over the last 20 years by the federal and state water projects for farms and cities.</p> <p>The State Water Resources Control Board could 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>For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.</p>
905	2	<p>Is this [similar tunnel projects in places like Santa Barbara County] not enough to prove the folly of this project?</p> <p>We can ill afford lowering the amounts of water to our Delta and bay. If we do, it will mean devastation to many critical habitats.</p> <p>By covering the aqueduct, we can save evaporation by having it condense and drip from special covers made to do that. It is done in other places. We can build structures to condense fog and have it drip to tanks. There are therefore other tacts we might take. Please consider these alternatives before dooming our rivers and all they provide for.</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>It is important to note the project 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 conservation. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
907	1	<p>Do not send our precious water that is life to many over to the oil corporations for drilling and to big agribusiness. We cannot get that water back or even recycle it after they are through with it.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole and not as a result of 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 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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			flexibility.
908	1	Stop the ego building tunnels, Governor. That is all this project is -- a scheme for building your ego. You are doing two things wrong as governor -- 1) pushing for these tunnels, and 2) pushing for the high-speed rail fiasco that violates the voter-approved bond issue as currently constituted. Build your legacy by restoring California's educational system to being the envy of the world as it was under your father's administrations.	<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>
909	1	Looking at the science, our future is drought with an occasional wet year. We cannot waste water on agriculture crops that are not sustainable in a dry climate. We cannot sacrifice water to be contaminated with chemicals.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The 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>
909	2	<p>Fracking needs to stop immediately.</p> <p>Renewable energy is the answer to our energy needs and this answer is ready for us to pursue right now.</p>	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
910	1	I thought this was a done deal and the Governor was not going ahead with it. Was it a fake to the right when we thought he was going left (and not in a political sense)?	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
911	1	It is time for California to end the water wars that big business always seems to win!	<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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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 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>
912	1	<p>This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our state cannot afford it. It will also result in increased fracking (and contamination of groundwater supplies).</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> <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>The state Department of Conservation is currently working on fracking regulations and rules passed by the Legislature have been sent to the governor. 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. The Department of Conservation estimates that statewide, about 270 acre-feet of water per year is used for hydraulic fracture stimulation activities. For comparison’s sake, roughly 5.2 million acre-feet of water a year have been diverted from the Delta, on average, over the last 20 years by the federal and state water projects for farms and cities.</p> <p>The State Water Resources Control Board could 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>For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.</p>
913	1	<p>This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our state cannot afford it. An entire river should not be redirected for the sake of large-scale, unmeted agriculture and the oil industry! This is insanity!</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 preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>alternatives, including Alternative 4A. 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. Therefore, this project is not the result of “favoring” large corporations (e.g., large agribusinesses and oil companies). 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 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) and Master Response 5 (Costs of Implementation and Funding).</p>
913	2	<p>This entire idea is done! Central and Southern California simply and ultimately have to learn to do with less... for there is less and will continue to be less!</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>
914	1	<p>Big agribusiness should not get more of California’s water... in fact, what they do get should be more regulation.</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 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>
915	1	<p>We oppose the tunnels. There are better solutions that will benefit the whole State instead of a few special interests, which include the tracking companies we do not want anymore.</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 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 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>
916	1	<p>I am sorry if you feel a need of another legacy project big enough to keep your name in the public eye for years to come, I really do not see I need to be paying large amounts of my tax money to something that is not correctly thought out or controlled from beginning to end.</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>For more information regarding funding of the proposed project please see Master Response 5.</p>
917	1	<p>Stop working for the big oil and agribusiness companies and start working for the people</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
		and our future!	<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>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>
918	1	This plan was rejected years ago under a different name. To call this a conservation project is laughable. Sending water to companies that will frack and pollute is insane! Think about what is best for California in the long run. The south western part of the San Joaquin is historically a dry spot. It is only because what it is from water being sent there at some other expense. Just stop!	<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. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34(Beneficial Use of Water), and Master Response 26 (Area of Origin).</p>
919	1	Jerry, what would Mary Jean Pew Say?!	<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>
920	1	This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time Californians already pay the highest taxes in the country besides Hawaii, and our state cannot afford to further burden the economy.	<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>Information regarding BDCP costs and funding is provided in Chapter 8, Implementation Costs and Funding Sources, BDCP. State Water Project and Central Valley Project contractors would be responsible for funding construction and operation of new water conveyance facilities, as well as the costs for mitigating the impacts associated with facility construction. Remaining costs for implementing the conservation plan would come from a variety of public sources, including federal appropriations, state and federal grants, and the water bond. Please see Master Response 5 for more information regarding costs of implementation and funding for proposed project.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
920	2	In California, water is priceless and scarce and must be conserved for human consumption.	Appendix 1C (Water Demand Management) of the EIR/EIS describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply, as well as Master Response 6. Although such water demand management strategies 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.
921	1	<p>Every time water is diverted, the community of origin and the destination community are adversely affected. I implore you to think carefully and deeply about the short and long term ramifications of this project.</p> <p>Mark Twain is known for many quotes but the one I think of most often is, "Whiskey is for drinking and water is for fighting over."</p> <p>There will always be conflicting interests when it comes to water. I hope that you and your colleagues keep the long term health and well being of our state and its many communities in mind when making this crucial decision.</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>
922	1	In this area, there is no consideration of reclaimed water use for greenbelt areas. There is talk of a tax raise to pay for potable water usage on some.	<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 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 <a href="http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf">http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf</a>. 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: <a href="http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/">http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/</a>.</p> <p>Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water 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>
923	1	Large corporate agriculture is the welfare queen of all time. The only challenger for the welfare queen title is the oil industry.	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



DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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>
923	2	What chutzpah for our Democratic governor to try to sneak this water theft scheme past the electorate.	<p>The proposed California WaterFix Project is designed to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years with project implementation. 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>
924	1	I have voted for you and hope I will be able to continue to support you. Water, global warming, and the environment are my most important issues.	<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>
925	1	Here is a thought: Do your job and support Californians for a change.	<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>
926	1	When the mighty dollar overrides common sense, you have chaos. Chaos = eminent destruction of a society. Do the civilized thing and make common sense sustainable choices. This is the way of the future and you know it. Do the right thing!	<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.</p>
927	1	Just say no to this project. We can do better for the California public and the California economy.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
928	1	<p>In this era of climate change, extreme weather, and specifically our drought, it is absurd to spend billions to pipe water to wasteful entities in the Southern California desert - those who insist on green lawns and golf courses and flood irrigation for farming - at the cost of more conservationist Northern California, where we have so much small organic farming, interest in gray-water systems, and other less wasteful programs and attitudes. Southern California should be looking to Las Vegas for smart water solutions, but should not be enabled to keep wasting water and edging the whole state toward a dust bowl. It is a terribly dangerous pattern of behavior to encourage.</p> <p>Equally important is the effect on the environment, the damage to all the beings in and along the rivers. Linch-pin species would be decimated, having catastrophic effects on our waterways and watersheds. The rights of Indigenous Peoples of California, which include water usage and ceremonial locations, would be grossly violated.</p> <p>The tunnels are dead wrong from every angle, and we cannot afford to mess up our water any more than has already been done. Please focus on real conservation measures and stopping misuse of water - especially abuses by mega-agriculture and other industries!</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 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. Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California’s water resources.</p> <p>Effects of the proposed water conveyance and associated restoration activities on general resource areas are discussed in each individual resource area for each project alternative in the FEIR/EIS. Resource areas are addressed separately under sections for each of the 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>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed and Master Response 6 regarding demand management</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.</p>
929	1	<p>I am adamantly opposed to spending money on this project. Please stop spending money on this project. The damage done to our Delta will be irrecoverable.</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. 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>
930	1	<p>The Bay Delta Conservation Plan would hardly conserve water, rather transport it, damaging ecosystems and further exasperate California’s drought problem. We need to protect our water sources and the ecosystems that drive them and practice better conservation methods-- not ram a pipe through California for a quick fix which would inevitably make the problem worse down the road.</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 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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply 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 conservation.</p> <p>Please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A.</p>
931	1	<p>Dear Moonbeam, you already have drained Northern California's reservoirs twice, and now you want to send all of our water south, get a grip you idiot, we did not elect your dumb ass, so you could rape Northern California, for the benefit of Southern California. You remember what happened to your predecessor, when he went over the deep end? You are probably going to cost the democrats, the next election. Because of your stupidity, people just are not going to vote for the demo ticket, after they have been raped for eight years. If you want to do California a favor (besides resigning), start building desalination plants in Sothern California, so they can be self-sufficient, and waste all they want to. Remember you were elected to serve all of California, not just your special interests pals.</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 California WaterFix Project is designed to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years with project implementation. 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>
932	1	<p>Farm Bureau's Agriculture Alert in 2004 quoted the U.S. Geological Survey, using tree ring reconstructions, writing, "Western drought is officially worse than Dust Bowl Years." "The drought could be the worst in 500 years, with the lowest flow in the Colorado River on record. The lowest five-year average of water flow was 8.84 million acre-feet in the years 1590-1594." "From 1999 through 2003, water flow has been 7.11 million acre-feet, comparable to or more severe than the largest-known drought in 500 years." "The water report did not surprise water managers."</p> <p>Farmers and water managers have known for more than a decade that we are in a drought, yet vineyards, and almond and walnut orchardists continue to plant throughout north, south, east, and west San Joaquin Valley as recently as this past winter 2014. The orchardist put an ongoing drain on water supplies as opposed to planting crops that does not require such intensive water usage.</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>
932	2	<p>No tunnels should be built to accommodate agriculture nor oil interests.</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>
933	1	<p>There is absolutely no reason to spend taxpayer dollars to fund a project that helps corporate agriculture at the expense of other projects like funding for schools, libraries, helping small agriculture farmers and organic farmers. Even worse, if this project makes</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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>more water available for fracking (i.e. the oil industry). The average/small farmers will use the water more wisely than big agriculture does because they, the small farmers, are the better stewards (caretakers) of the land.</p> <p>The last thing California needs in a severe drought is fracking and other ways that both the corporate agriculture and oil waste water and harm the environment.</p>	<p>index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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>
933	2	<p>Please do not waste any taxpayer money on such projects, especially when there are so many other places the money could be spent that would have a favorable impact on many more California residents --- those of us who pay our full taxes and do not use loopholes to find ways to not pay our fair share of the tax burden like the corporations do.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my comments. Please use the money for the greater good of the many!</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>
934	1	<p>This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars and endanger the entire Delta ecosystem. As a San Jose resident, much of the water I use is from the Delta, and I am willing to make the sacrifice (and already am) to conserve water to ensure that this tunnel project never needs to be built. Let us reuse and recycle all our water. This is the important issue, not spending billions of dollars to subsidize existing wasteful uses.</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> <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 <a href="http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf">http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf</a>. 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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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: <a href="http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/">http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/</a>.</p> <p>Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water 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> <p>More than two-thirds of the residents of the state and more than two million acres of highly productive farm land receive water exported from the Delta watershed. The proposed project aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. However, the project proponents have no authority to designate what water is used for.</p> <p>One of the State Water Resources Control Board’s (State Water Board’s) charges is to ensure that the State’s water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board’s planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board.</p> <p>The proposed project Lead Agencies have no power to impose penalties on individual water users. DWR and Reclamation have contracts with various entities, some of which sell water to water retailers, who have individual policies and programs to motivate ratepayers to conserve water. Different districts have the right to take different approaches depending on their individual circumstances.</p> <p>For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34.</p>
934	2	Water recycling has already been proven safe and effective in the huge reverse osmosis plant in Anaheim, and even cheaper and more effective membranes are now available. Let us multiply that approach to the rest of California!	<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 (such as desalination or water storage) that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p>
935	1	It is now time to protect our water supply, to protect the 99% of people who cannot afford and do not want this project which would be used for fracking. You are siding with the mega-agribusiness and oil corps again! Stop right now. This is no good for anyone in the long-run!	<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 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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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).
936	1	Methods of water use need updating in many parts of the world, to streamline localized practice, to move towards sustainability in all areas, to focus funds and efforts on preparing for future developments in this way. It seems obvious, in the political scope of anything on this scale, but maybe you have not realized 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 comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
937	1	<p>This is a very bad idea... whatever happened to Jerry Brown, who did not appear to be a bought and paid for politician in the old days. You are dramatically disappointing in your greed for power and money these days... a slave to the unions, for their votes (I support unions-most-but not Bart and some of the others in this state)... what legacy do you want to leave?</p> <p>A not well thought out and much too expensive rail system, a poor idea of twin tunnels, which most of the California population does not support, a sloppy job on the Bay Bridge (although that cannot be attributed to your reign, but your actions and some of your half assed policies reverberate in our state).</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
938	1	This is essentially privatizing our water, our water. Yes, it is a resource for all Californians.	<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>
939	1	Use the money to repair roads and infrastructure instead of raising gasoline taxes!	<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 regarding the purpose and need for the proposed project.</p>
940	1	No fracking period.	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.</p>
941	1	<p>This tunnel project is unconscionable. To use our precious water for fracking purposes is a crime, and so is the water intensive cultivation of pistachios and almonds in the desert. It is time for us to adjust to the new reality of scarce water and change our 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>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water timing designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 34(Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
942	1	<p>Please save our last natural water sources!</p> <p>We cannot give up precious California water to unsustainable businesses like pesticide/round-up using agribusinesses and out-dated, air-polluting oil businesses.</p> <p>Our waters will continue to be polluted increasingly if they get the Sacramento River 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 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>
942	2	<p>Please do the right thing!</p> <p>We need you to reconsider!</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
943	1	<p>I do not really see how this benefits the oil companies, but it does not seem to benefit anyone - perhaps the contractors. If the yield increase is lower than the cost to build, then do not build. It will have a detrimental effect on the Delta - so it seems more like a lose, lose proposition. It does seem like there might be other solutions that guarantee a return, not speculate on a return and even the speculated return is iffy.</p> <p>My opinion - you do not get the permit until or unless all these issues are addressed. No harm to the Delta, Guaranteed water supply to everyone not just some, and the financial benefit out ways the cost in dollar and cents.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. 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 of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.</p> <p>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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>activities on general 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 was written for the 2013 Public Draft BDCP 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> <p>Construction of the proposed California WaterFix water conveyance facilities would be sequenced over approximately 10 years. Construction of individual components (e.g. intakes, tunnels) would range from one to six years. Temporary construction-related impacts include noise, visual, and transportation, among others. The construction-related impacts are disclosed in individual resource area chapters in the EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS.</p> <p>As part of the planning and environmental assessment process, the project proponents will incorporate environmental commitments and best management practices (BMPs) into the action alternatives to avoid or minimize potential adverse effects (a NEPA term) and potential significant impacts (a CEQA term). The project proponents will implement these environmental commitments as part of the project construction activities. In other words, these commitments will be satisfied even if not separately imposed by the permitting agencies. If permitting agencies impose additional measures or modifications, those will also be adhered to as part of the permit(s). The project proponents will coordinate planning, engineering, design and construction, operation, and maintenance phases of the alternative with the appropriate agencies. For more information regarding Environmental Commitments please see Appendix 3B of the RDEIR/SDEIS.</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>
944	1	<p>The water is needed for local cities and towns, for local farmers and for the health of our environment and wildlife, which are also essential to local populations.</p> <p>Oil companies would use much of the water for fracking which puts toxins in the water to the detriment of local communities and ecosystems, while profits are taken by the companies. Big agribusiness likewise will take the profits out of state, while California communities are deprived of water, and possibly find their water contains pesticides, and are sickened by pesticide spraying, or suffering both from drift from GMO pollen, and more Franken foods on the market.</p> <p>An absolute no to the 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>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water timing designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>



DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
945	1	<p>Why not use massive solar arrays to power desalinization plants and provide the water that way. Eventually we will need to do that anyway.</p> <p>Why not start now.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>See Master Response 7 for a more detailed discussion of various desalination projects under consideration and in development at this time.</p>
946	1	<p>Moreover, the twin tunnels will be the death of the Delta, because it does not pump more water through it, which it now needs, and would probably produce more salt in the Delta. Worse yet, taking away 140,000-160,000 acres of Delta farmers' lands is a crime and huge land grab for the benefit of who? Desert farmers to grow walnuts and pistachios? How stupid do you think the citizens are?</p> <p>For an alternative, the BDCP should have better studied the Dr. Robert Pyke plan for the Western Delta Intake Concept (WDIC) that makes more sense, would be agreeable to Delta farmers, and takes the Delta water at Sherman Island after it goes through the Delta, and best yet, would cost far less. Another good thing, it would do minimal damage to all other aspects of the California Delta.</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 note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. Appendix 3A thoroughly explains why various proposals were not analyzed in the EIR/EIS, including the NRDC Portfolio-Based Proposal, Congressman Garamendi's Water Plan, and other similar concepts that would require actions that are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Please see RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, Impact AG-1 and Impact AG-2 and their associated mitigation measures for complete analysis of how the proposed project will effect and mediate important farmland in the Delta.</p> <p>For more information regarding alternatives to the proposed project please see Master Response 4.</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 3.</p> <p>For more information regarding salinity please see Master Response 14 and Chapter 8 of the FEIR/EIS.</p>
946	2	<p>Please quit insulting our intelligence with propaganda scare tactics like there is an earthquake boogie man who is going to collapse all the levees. The Delta is not in the Bay Area earthquake prone zone and you know it.</p>	<p>The Delta is not subject to the same degree of overall seismic risk (i.e., threat of ground shaking and surface fault rupture) as much of the Bay area. However, although there is little threat of surface rupture in the Delta, the hazard of seismic ground shaking is moderate to high, based on expected seismic shaking modeling results conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey and DWR. See Section 3E.2.4.2 Ground Acceleration (Ground Shaking) of Appendix 3E and Section 9.1.1.4.2 Earthquake Ground Shaking in Chapter 9 of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS.</p> <p>A moderate to strong earthquake could cause simultaneous levee failures on several Delta islands, which would result in island flooding with resultant island flooding. In 2002, the Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities estimated that an earthquake of magnitude 6.7 or greater has a 62 percent probability of occurring in the San Francisco Bay Area before 2032, and could cause 20 or more islands to flood at the same time.</p> <p>The proposed project does not purport to protect existing levees from seismic ground shaking. Although the proposed project is not intended to provide enhanced flood protection, it does intend to reduce the vulnerability of the water delivery system by making it less reliant upon the Delta levee system (and associated risks thereto). Further, the proposed project does not envision a change in the state's flood protection policies or programs. For more information on levee stability and seismic risk please see Master Response 16.</p>
947	1	<p>Water is a scarce resource and it should be protected from abuses from big oil and big business. California would be better off going back to smaller family farms, producing</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>organic food, and helping our environment along the way. Corporate America has a long history of abusing everything they touch, putting profit above all else, let us not have our water legacy be just another corporate rip-off.</p>	<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 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>
948	1	<p>The proposed tunnels will do nothing to resolve the state's water issues, in fact, they will only compound them. Use that money to build desalination plants in the south, have agribusiness utilize water conservation measures to irrigate their fields.</p> <p>The tunnels are another boondoggle just like the Peripheral Canals.</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>Although conservation components 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 BDCP or California WaterFix. 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, water recycling, etc. For more information regarding water demand management and desalination please see Master Response 6 and 7, respectively.</p>
949	1	<p>Desalination seems more appropriate given that sea levels will be rising so taking sea water may well reduce the potential for flooding and doing it now will be cheaper than 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>Please see Master Response 4 for discussion of the scope of the proposed project and alternatives (such as desalination) that were not carried forward for analysis in this document due to the fact that required actions beyond the scope of the proposed project. However, nothing in the proposed project would prevent other entities from pursuing innovative approaches to desalination or other water supply solutions. As described in Appendix 3A, Section 3A.7, Results of Initial Screening of Conveyance Alternatives, EIR/EIS (2013), desalination was included as part of Alternative B7. Issues related to desalination include land use impacts, costs, and substantial energy use requirements. Advances in technology have improved feasibility of desalination and as a statewide water use planning component; it will be evaluated by water agencies on a local/regional level.</p> <p>Desalination, the process of removing salt and other minerals from seawater to make it suitable for drinking or irrigation, is being implemented in several California communities. However, it has not proven viable to secure adequate water supplies to meet California's needs due to high costs and energy demands.</p> <p>Today, desalination creates an estimated 84,000 acre-feet of potable water a year in the state, mostly</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>through treatment of brackish groundwater, which is less salty and cheaper to treat than sea water. In comparison, the proposed project would secure an estimated 4.7 to 5.2 million acre-feet of water to supply more than 25 million people and 3 million acres of farmland.</p> <p>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. Local water agencies will need to invest in additional strategies and technologies, including desalination, to meet future water demand.</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 7 regarding desalination.</p> <p>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 proposed project. 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 project alternatives would be able to completely counteract all of the impacts of climate change.</p> <p>The State of California has acknowledged that sea level rise threatens coastal and near coastal resources (such as the Delta and Delta water supplies) and that adaptation and resiliency planning to protect these resources from expected levels of sea level rise is appropriate. (OPC, 2013)  <a href="http://www.opc.ca.gov/2013/04/update-to-the-sea-level-rise-guidance-document/">http://www.opc.ca.gov/2013/04/update-to-the-sea-level-rise-guidance-document/</a></p> <p>(CCC, 2013) <a href="http://www.coastal.ca.gov/climate/SLRguidance.html">http://www.coastal.ca.gov/climate/SLRguidance.html</a></p> <p>EO S-3-05. <a href="http://gov.ca.gov/news.php?id=1861">http://gov.ca.gov/news.php?id=1861</a></p> <p>EO S-13-08 <a href="http://gov.ca.gov/news.php?id=11036">http://gov.ca.gov/news.php?id=11036</a></p> <p>AB 32 also mentions SLR as a threat to California.</p> <p>California Waterfix would help to address the resilience and adaptability of the Delta to climate change through water delivery facilities combined with a range of operational scenarios, measures focused on the protection, restoration, and enhancement of the Delta ecosystem and measures to reduce other stressors (Environmental Commitments 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16. In addition to the added water management flexibility created by new water diversions and operational scenarios, California Waterfix would improve habitat, increase food supplies and reduce the effects of other stressors on the Delta ecosystem. By improving and expanding available habitat, the proposed project would increase resilience and adaptability to climate change by making alternative habitat available during periods of high stress, such as very high or low freshwater inflow or very high salinity intrusion.</p> <p>Multiple analyses were performed in the proposed project to test the robustness of the alternatives to a range of potential future conditions. Water supply, aquatic and terrestrial resources were all analyzed with projected future conditions. The proposed project will likely remain in place and functional far into the future when salinity intrusion may require less frequent use of the south Delta pumps. Far from being stranded assets, the tunnels will be part of the state’s strategy in adapting to climate change.</p> <p>More information on ways in which the BDCP/California WaterFix proposes to improve resiliency and</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			adaptability of the Delta to climate change can be found in Chapter 29, Climate Change, EIR/EIS and Appendix A RDEIR/SDEIS and Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS (in appendix A).
950	1	I oppose any and all support to the natural gas industry in the form of cheap water for hydraulic fracturing. The environmental costs of this technique are well documented. There are better ways to generate electricity. I also oppose all water-intensive farming operations. We are in a bad drought which may or may not end soon. For the sake of our environment, public health and our local economies we need to reduce waste, grow food more locally, and stop fracking. Just because large industries have a ton of money to throw around does not mean they should get to maintain their destructive practices. What is the point of living in California if we cannot enjoy our natural resources and eat real food?	<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>
951	1	The project is only viable with the maximum water flow, which they will not get, and the current cost estimate. If the cost overruns are even a fraction of what there were on the Brown's (Jerry and Willie) bridge the water flows less than maximum the project will be a financial disaster on top of the given environmental disaster.	<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 also refer to Master Response 5 regarding costs and funding of the project. Please see Appendix B Supplemental Modeling Results for New Alternatives of the RDEIR/SDEIS.</p>
952	1	We, the people, do not want this project to go forward!	<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 2013 Draft EIR/EIS documentation.</p>
953	1	If agribusiness wants more water they should pay for it by financing their own off drainage impoundments to collect water in the winter so that they can use it in the summer to irrigate their crops. They should pay for their own water collection and irrigation projects.	<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>Please refer to Master Response 5. The EIR/EIS indicates that additional water contractors may become project proponents in the future (see Chapter 1, Introduction).</p>
954	1	This project will cost \$20-\$70 billion? Of taxpayer dollars, at a time when our state cannot afford it. An entire river should not be redirected for the sake of large-scale, unmetered agriculture and the oil (fracking) industry. Dirty Energy already gets subsidies and is practically not taxed! 5 million gallons of water per fracked well is an insidious and dangerous (irradiated chemical pools of wastewater) gamble on our ecosystem, already in	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
		place it seems, although you said you were on the side of clean energy.	<p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The construction of the water delivery facilities is estimated to cost \$14.9 billion, an amount that would be paid for by the state and federal water contractors who rely on Delta exports. The range of costs for water vary widely among contractors south of the Delta. Costs depend on the source of water, transport facilities, energy requirements, among other factors. For the agricultural customers of the CVP, prices range from \$100 per acre-foot to more than \$400 per acre-foot. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, which buys water from the SWP, estimates that the cost of the proposed project would translate into about \$5.00 extra per household, per month in its service area. The final cost of water from the new conveyance facilities would be determined by numerous factors. A number of these significant factors, such as the project yield and allocation of costs, have yet to be determined. Please see Master Response 5 for information regarding funding of the proposed project. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 34(Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
954	2	This is a big present to corporations at the (serious) expense to our pockets. Big no.	Please refer to Master Response 5 regarding costs and funding of the project.
955	1	<p>We know that California agriculture is primarily industrial agriculture, operated by CEO's whose first and most important goal is to maximize profits. Hence their desire to minimize cost of production, and one way is keep water available at low cost. However this goal is at odds with the reality of water availability of California. Rather than cave-in to these very powerful agribusiness corporations, please advise them to keep improving their efficiency and conservation in water use and urge them to reduce plantings that use more water. We also know now that feedlots and Central Valley dairies are huge water users. These corporate users should not be subsidized with cheap water, but rather if they cannot earn a high enough return on investment, move to a more accommodative location, like where grass will grow!</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. The proposed project does not propose any changes to existing agricultural or irrigation practices. 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> <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>
955	2	<p>To subsidize water for fracking! Really? With what we know now about fracking, the technology is not perfected, and contamination of groundwater supplies is common, and the water used in fracking becomes contaminated and unusable. At a time when the Governor is asking residents to conserve, offering these oil companies water we do not have is absurd. I suggest that we keep our oil in the ground until the technology is improved and we will not have to worry about water contamination and air pollution. Besides the price of oil will just go up over time, and I am sure we will regret having extracted the resource just to burn it up to go a few more miles now (and contribute to further global climate change)... It will be worth so much more to us in the future, and so will our clean air and available water.</p>	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
956	1	<p>It amazes me that we even have to put forth a petition like this one!</p> <p>Water is California is becoming a most precious resource. We need to protect it not allow</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

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>corporate greed to pollute it!</p> <p>Please do the right thing!</p>	<p>index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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>
957	1	<p>At a time when we barely have enough to drink we should not be using our precious water for fracking. We need to figure out better ways for clean energy. Knowing how dangerous fracking is, the Governor should be ashamed of himself for even acknowledging this plan and allowing it to try to push past us. Sounds very dishonest and like he is being bought.</p> <p>I will vote and petition to be sure this does not pass.</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. State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to stipulated beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows. Fracking presumably would be an “industrial” use of water. As of the present, hydraulic fracturing is a lawful use of water, as state law generally permits oil and gas operators to engage in “the injection of air, gas, water, or other fluids into the productive strata, the application of pressure heat or other means for the reduction of viscosity of the hydrocarbons, the supplying of additional motive force, or the creating of enlarged or new channels for the underground movement of hydrocarbons into production wells[.]” (Cal. Pub. Resources Code, § 3106[b].)</p> <p>The state Department of Conservation is currently working on fracking regulations and rules passed by the Legislature have been sent to the governor. 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. The Department of Conservation estimates that statewide, about 270 acre-feet of water per year is used for hydraulic fracture stimulation activities. For comparison’s sake, roughly 5.2 million acre-feet of water a year have been diverted from the Delta, on average, over the last 20 years by the federal and state water projects for farms and cities.</p> <p>The State Water Resources Control Board could 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>Refer to Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
958	1	<p>It is time to do real water conservation, and stop shunting rivers around. How about some water meters in the City of Sacramento, the State Capitol? How about a law mandating water meters throughout California?</p> <p>Wake up!</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. 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
			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.
959	1	I am sitting within sight of Mt Shasta and have been allotted zero water this year, yet you want to spend billions for tunnels to water farms hundreds of miles away? To send almonds to the world? My sheep are eating brown weeds. Water for California and US consumer's food needs should come first. Those who export their crops should be paying the cost of drought, not the little guys like me wanting to feed our neighbors.	<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>
960	1	This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our State cannot afford it. History is watching you!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The cost of the construction and operation of the new water facilities, as well as for mitigation necessary to address impacts to terrestrial and aquatic species associated with construction and operation, will be paid by participating state and federal water contractors. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on project funding and Master 5 for more information on project cost.</p>
961	1	They take and take and take! This country is founded on the idea of "We the people" but we have moved so far away from what our forefathers signed into action. It is now all for the corporation and they and our government make we the people pay and pay and pay!	<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>
961	2	Diverting a river! How much will that cost? And will those who will benefit the most pay for this? Yes, I do mean the corporations who will gain millions and billions as the tax-paying public pay for it.	Please refer to Master Response 5, which addresses BDCPCWF funding.
961	3	No, Gov. Brown you used to be for the people. You used to be a politician the people could be proud of but this is a disaster waiting to happen on several fronts.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
961	4	We all know that water is fast becoming the oil of this decade -- and will we give this life-giving resource to the people to drink and live or do we give it to corporations who will	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 [i.e., agribusinesses and oil/gas companies]." In

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		use it to frack and ruin whole environments or agribusinesses who will sell their crops abroad?	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. The commenter is referred to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need). 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 fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
961	5	The cost is just too high! Serve the good of the people of this state and not corporate interests. People over profits!	Please refer to Master Response 5 regarding costs and funding of the project.
962	1	The problem is by growing the wrong crops like rice for our water starved area. The population is more important than the massive greedy industries mentioned.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. The comment raised on the types of crops is beyond the scope of the proposed action. The Lead Agencies do not have local land use planning authority or control or local zoning practices. Instead, refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan’s strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation. 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.</p>
963	1	We have so little clean water and it needs to be conserved for drinking, and the threat of firefighting. Water intensive crops must be discouraged, not enabled at a huge cost. Hydraulic fracturing is a monumental waste of water and risk of contaminating our precious supply of drinking water, when there are renewable alternative energy supplies available. I really cannot understand why something so dangerous to our water supply is being allowed. How can a blind eye be turned on this issue, when our reservoirs are close to empty?	<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>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to 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, and is a lawful use of water. Pursuant to Senate Bill 4 from 2013 (Stats. 2013, Ch.313), moreover, the state Department of Conservation, through its Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR), is currently working on fracking regulations. Please see Master Response 34 for additional information regarding use of water delivered by project facilities.</p> <p>The 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 project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and</p>



DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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, storage, 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). The proposed project would not increase the amount of water to which SWP and CVP hold water rights for use allowed under their contracts and permits and approvals for refuge water supplies or other environmental purposes.</p>
964	1	<p>I am especially unsympathetic to the oil companies because the fracking storage wells and the voids created by the removal of oil and earth create earthquakes and this is earthquake prone California. We have sunshine. Go solar. We do not have an abundance of water, which fracking requires lots of and then contaminates it. Please leave the river as it is.</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>
965	1	<p>The big agribusiness and big oil are the worst polluters on the planet and should not get water at our expense; big oil to make more profits for fracking operations which would pollute our state's already precious water resources and big agriculture to continue abusive factory farm 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>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>
965	2	<p>Please, please do not allow this - stop the tunnels and stop the corporate boondoggle now!</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>
966	1	<p>Stop the wholesale disintegration of our environment to cave to big business, both agriculture and oil. It is quite apparent that small local agribusiness is best fiscally and physically. It is only big money and small minds that will continue to allow profit to be the only determining factor in public projects. Side with the future and stop this project funded by the dying Goliath(s). .</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>
967	1	<p>For heaven sakes, meter the agriculture industry, like the rest of us, and please stop doing what big oil wants.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The 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 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>
967	2	Please stop the fracking! In a state like ours, to waste water that way, to pollute it, to redirect it, to risk quakes with fracking--none of it makes sense.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
967	3	Why cannot California spend the tunnel money to develop the solar and wind grids, good jobs, good energy, like Germany, like China.	Please see Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the proposed project.
967	4	The tunnel plan is so bad and so unexpected from you that our whole family is shocked!	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.
967	5	Please do not go ahead with the tunnel project. California voters do not want it.	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. 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.
968	1	<p>Dear Jerry B., as one of your longtime supporters, I feel dumbfounded that you even suppose I might favor the water-diversion-by-tunnel idea. I cannot believe it is your idea; you know better. It would become another Owens Valley or China Town story for a later, much poorer generation of Californians. It smells like a crass proposal from Westlands Water District.</p> <p>Governor, drive south on I-5 past Coalinga where anti-government billboards demand even more irrigation water for farms. See there the hillsides of orchards with their high water demands. (You will not see from I-5 Kesterson sump, where the hillside runoff of an unnatural excess water has leached toxic selenium, causing horrible malformation of new chicks of migrating waterfowl.) This is Westlands Water District turf. South a bit farther, you will see fields of cotton, a known water-guzzling crop, and then, mixed with oil pumps. I have read (in McClatchy papers) that Westlands has, at some times past, sold some of its water to the L.A. Metropolitan Water District!</p> <p>Yet, by gosh, these latecomers to the irrigation net send lobbyists to Sacramento to demand (not request) more water from the Sacramento Delta. (The San Joaquin has not yet become a river again.) The hillsides of Westlands should be re-purchased by governments and allowed to return to their normal arid condition. Selling them was an honest mistake before people knew about the leaching of selenium.</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>
969	1	This project would be the death of the Delta and negatively impact wildlife in general and	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

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		salmon in particular.	<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>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. 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.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water 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 45 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <p>Resource areas are addressed separately in the EIR/EIS under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including Aquatic Resources (Chapter 11) and terrestrial resources (Chapter 12). Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments and mitigation measures will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible.</p>
970	1	This proposed redesign of Mother Nature ultimately helps no one, at great cost to ordinary taxpayers, and to the environment, at once undermining the pillars of society, and the source of life itself, our planet free of man-made pollution and contamination, leading to our own destruction. Only those who would directly benefit from this misallocation, should be paying the costs, the full costs. It is clearly unwise to subsidize the theft of natural resources from one part of the state to send them to another part. Local areas need to rely on what they have available locally; transportation costs have never been zero, nor will they ever be.	<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>For more information regarding funding sources please see Master Response 5. Please see Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the proposed project.</p>
971	1	Please put water conservation practices into effect for all Californians including the agriculture and oil business. We need the water more than their products!	<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 refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p>
972	1	If the plan is to use some of this water for fracking, this is insanity. I do not want my tax dollars going to support this most destructive, dangerous and polluting process.	<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
			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. 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).
973	1	Back off on the tunnels, Governor! Put the people ahead of corporate profits.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole and not as a result of oil corporations or large agribusiness. 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>
974	1	Not one drop to big oil or agricorps, nor to water lawns in Beverly Hills. That is our water - Northern California's.	<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. To provide additional clarification, refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply), and Master Response 25 (Upstream Reservoir Effects). The project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole and not as a result of oil corporations or large agribusinesses. The environmental documentation and project approval will be acted on by the decision makers from each lead agency at the conclusion of the final environmental documentation for both CEQA and NEPA.</p>
975	1	Fracking is horrible for our environment!	<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>
976	1	<p>I am an attorney and have studied environmental law. Those studies have given me a broader perspective regarding California's water use.</p> <p>The tunnels you propose will not solve the issues of waste, contamination of local drinking water, failure to regulate underground water, pumping, and fracking. In fact, the siphoning off of millions of gallons of Delta water will exacerbate those problems.</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 note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. Note the proposed project is not intended to solve all issues involving water resources generally. Its purpose is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta needed to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need). 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].) 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 more water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination.</p>
977	1	<p>67 billion? Really? While we the people foot the bill? Hell no. Do not pollute our precious water resources for big oil corporations and big agribusinesses. No H2O for fracking or pistachios!!</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The construction of the water delivery facilities is estimated to cost \$14.9 billion, an amount that would be paid for by the state and federal water contractors who rely on Delta exports. The range of costs for water vary widely among contractors south of the Delta. Costs depend on the source of water, transport facilities, energy requirements, among other factors. For the agricultural customers of the CVP, prices range from \$100 per acre-foot to more than \$400 per acre-foot. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, which buys water from the SWP, estimates that the cost of the proposed project would translate into about \$5.00 extra per household, per month in its service area. The final cost of water from the new conveyance facilities would be determined by numerous factors. A number of these significant factors, such as the project yield and allocation of costs, have yet to be determined. Please see Master Response 5 for information regarding funding of the proposed project. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 34(Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
978	1	<p>This water project will only be a short-term solution. We need to address the real problems--over population and over consumption of natural resources</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 Lead Agencies have no authority concerning over population issues, i.e., local land use planning mandate. The commenter's concerns are discussed in the State's California Water Action Plan, which can be found online at: <a href="http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf">http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf</a>. That plan also 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 Action Plan here: <a href="http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/">http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/</a>.</p>
979	1	<p>It is far more important to preserve the delicate river ecosystems and the wildlife and plants they sustain. Please do not divert the water to greedy corporate agribusiness and dangerous extraction industries.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The BDCP process has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole and not as a result of large corporations (i.e., agribusinesses and oil/gas</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			industries). 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).
980	1	I feel especially strongly that we should not be giving away water for the purpose of fracking, which pollutes groundwater and poisons our communities, while California is suffering from the worst drought in its history. This is not in the best interests of our citizens.	<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>
981	1	<p>Send more of our water to big agribusiness and big oil?</p> <p>Just say no to the \$67 billion twin tunnel project!</p> <p>We get the bill!</p> <p>In the midst of one of the worst droughts on record, Governor Brown is pushing a massive twin tunnel project to send more water to corporate agriculture and oil companies in the Central Valley--all at our expense.</p> <p>A few powerful agricultural interests and oil companies on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley are demanding more water for themselves on the backs of Californians. Oil companies want more water for fracking, which contaminates fresh water with toxic chemicals. Big agribusiness 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> <p>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 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 storm water capture.</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. Please see Master Response 3 for more information on the purpose and need for the project. 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. Please refer to Master Response 26 regarding diversions.</p> <p>Information regarding project costs and funding is provided in Chapter 8 of the 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. 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> <p>Please see Master Response 34 regarding use of water associated with project facilities. 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.</p> <p>The proposed project can complement current and proposed state and local programs for water conservation with improved operational flexibility. Over the next five years, fundamental changes to California's water resource management will be made through the California Water Action Plan, which includes water conservation actions. Water conservation efforts at a local level are described in Master Response 6 regarding water demand management and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, and Appendix 5B, Responses to Reduced South of Delta Water Supplies, EIR/EIS.</p>
982	1	I, like most other Californians, am doing my best to conserve water during what is most likely the beginning of an extended drought, El Ninos and La Ninas aside. I, like most other Californians and as I should, have made some fundamental personal changes in my relation to water. I did this to help save the ecosystem of the Delta. I did not do this so megafarms can grow almonds and other inappropriate crops in the desert, or so Los Angelans can have	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
		green lawns and swimming pools or, horrors, to be used for hydraulic fracturing.	<p>to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. 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 6 (Demand Management), Master Response 34(Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 26 (Area of Origin), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>
983	1	If they want it, they can buy it, so we, the people of California can make money off our water. The companies can pay the state billions, not us paying for them. They do not cut us any slack on food or gas.	<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 the lead agencies have assessed the benefits as described in the BDCP funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those facilities. Expenditures of public money from other sources would be limited to restoration activities beyond those needed to mitigate the impacts of facility construction. BDCP Chapter 8, which deals 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>
983	2	Stop giving the people's resources away to corporations who profit from it at our cost.	<p>The proposed project is costly, but the lead agencies have assessed the benefits as described in the BDCP funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those facilities. Expenditures of public money from other sources would be limited to restoration activities beyond those needed to mitigate the impacts of facility construction. BDCP Chapter 8, which deals 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>
984	1	<p>I am concerned that the water that is redirected will go to water-intensive industries that do not benefit the population of the Central Valley. Instead of a long-term conservation plan that will reduce water usage over the long term, this plan will only encourage the expansion of water-intensive agriculture and water-polluting petrochemical activities. Instead, I would support a plan that encourages water conservation practices in agriculture and alternative energy development to supplant the petroleum industry.</p> <p>Only by favoring better conservation techniques in agriculture, construction, land development and petroleum exploration can we fix the Valley's long-term water shortage. This expensive tunnel project does not attack the root causes of our water shortage and will not benefit the wider community in the Valley.</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>The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the proposed project . For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan’s strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures,</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
985	1	Even one drop of water used or wasted in the course of fracking should not be allowed much less subsidized by our governments -- local, state or federal.	<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>
986	1	I am an organic gardener scrimping on water to raise our vegetables and when I hear about fracking and huge water tunnels I have to say I get mad. There is no provision for the people of this state who simply want to grow their own food without toxic chemicals! Please, no huge water tunnels!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. 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. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 34(Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
987	1	Building tunnels will not create more water. As time goes on, we are going to have even less. We need to spend our money getting more good out of the water we do have, and that does not mean sending it to the people who will get the richest if they get 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>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 aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way that is more protective of fish than the current system. 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.</p>
988	1	Again, here is an example of a corporate takeover of precious natural resources, which should be very carefully allocated to the all, not the few. I do not want water being diverted to be used by wasteful fracking and agribusiness operations.	<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 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</p>



DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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).
989	1	Any river has its own ecosystems along its banks. Redirecting a river would destroy all these ecosystems and the wildlife in them plus riverbanks would be unstable and more subject to erosion.	<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 does not offer any evidence on how the project would result in significant riparian ecosystem impacts related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
989	2	There is no reason whatsoever to destroy so much for large agribusiness and any oil companies that could even use the water for fracking; a dangerous misuse and seriously robbing people of drinkable water.	<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>
990	1	Put your efforts in to desalination. We have an entire ocean at our doorstep!	<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> <p>Please see Master Response 7, which describes why an alternative focused on desalination is not included in the EIR/EIS. Desalination is one strategy used in California to develop new supplies, yet it is not the primary solution for the State's water shortage due to many factors, including limited capacity and technology, high costs and energy demands, and regulatory uncertainty.</p>
991	1	<p>I am concerned about the impact of water diversion on salmon and sturgeon populations, and the health of the Delta.</p> <p>I am even more concerned about the water which will be permanently polluted by use in fracking. Fracking in our state must be stopped and one way is to deny the companies standing to profit by poisoning our public land and water--to deny them access to that water (our water) in the first place.</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>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</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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. For more information regarding impacts to aquatic resources and its mitigation measures please see Chapter 11 of the FEIR/EIS.</p>
992	1	<p>What a horrible legacy this will leave you, less clean water overall and greater costs. Your grandchildren will need to change their last names.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p>
993	1	<p>It is time to stop this insanity. Not only because it burdens the taxpayer to benefit big agriculture and big oil, they have too many hand outs already. But it also robs the ecosystem in Sacramento of the water that we, human and other species, have grown to rely on for our needs.</p> <p>The LA area should be left to dry out naturally and people can move to the 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>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 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 costly, but the lead agencies have assessed the benefits as described in the BDCP funding sources. Notably, the water contractors benefitting from the proposed project and their constituents will bear all costs associated with constructing new conveyance facilities and mitigating for the impacts of those facilities. Expenditures of public money from other sources would be limited to restoration activities beyond those needed to mitigate the impacts of facility construction. BDCP Chapter 8, which deals with cost issues, and cost-benefit analysis information are available on the BDCP website. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on project costs and funding.</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need of the proposed project please see Master Response 45.</p>
994	1	<p>Replace lawns and water wasting flora in desert climates and keep our water in the rivers for nature. Conserve and live within your natural limits.</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. 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 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and</p>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
995	1	We lost the fish in Central California because of pumping and dams supported by the Corps of Engineers. Until those fisheries are restored, there should be no action on another potential devastation of resources and wildlife. Put energy instead into the high speed rail system and de-salinization plants.	<p>water conservation.</p> <p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The preferred alternative, 4A, includes operational criteria intended to minimize and avoid impacts on fish and mitigation to reduce any significant effects.</p>
996	1	You are endangering the Delta by this project, no matter what your politicians say. This is against all that the Endangered Species Act stands for. There is no way that removing more water from the system will improve water quality! Stop!	<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 project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole. Through this extensive process, the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. For the issues raised by the commenter, please refer to Master Responses: Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 5 (Compliance with ESA, Conservation Measure 1 as a CM, Overview of Restoration and Enhancement Activities), Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports/Area of Origin/Water Rights), and Master Response 14 (Water Quality). 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>
997	1	No more giveaways to corporations! This is the same stupid rubbish as the Peripheral Canals in the 1960s--siphoning precious water for corporate leeches--fracking and colossal agribusiness.	<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. Providing regulatory oversight to oil companies or large agribusiness is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. . 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>
998	1	Turn off the spigot for fracking and wasteful factory growers who, for as long as we remember, use overhead watering in the middle of the day to irrigate their crops. They need to re-pay Californians for wasting our 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>

DEIRS Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
999	1	<p>\$67 billion would be better invested in wise water conservation projects and research and development toward a cure for our addiction to finite petroleum products. Free unmeted water for agribusiness discourages simple water conservation techniques and distorts markets. Corporate moochers should not be allowed to use public taxpayer dollars to line their pockets.</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</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> <p>The proposed alternative (referred to in the RDEIR/SDEIS as Alternative 4A) is estimated to cost significantly less relative to the former preferred alternative (Alternative 4 under the BDCP). The difference in cost is largely due to the reduced level of restoration specifically funded by the project, as well as other Conservation Measures that are not included under Alternative 4A. As such, the total estimated cost for Alternative 4A is \$14.9 billion in undiscounted 2014 dollars. The estimated cost to implement the former preferred alternative under BDCP is \$24.7 billion in undiscounted 2012 dollars.</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 <a href="http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf">http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf</a>. 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: <a href="http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/">http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/</a>.</p> <p>Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water 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>

