

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Kathy Klusky <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 3:33 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 27, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

I think it is particularly significant that auxiliary impacts were ignored, such as the dam modifications, in the impact statement. This amounts to false advertising. The Southern part of the state is overbuilt, and it should not have been allowed to occur. The North part of the state should not in any way be degraded or abused to support the over-building in the South. Now you try to paper over it. You would create havoc and wholesale environmental destruction if you were to succeed.

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

RECIRC 2484

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Ms. Kathy Klusky  
10844 Ambassador Dr  
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670-2430  
(916) 635-2469  
mccreek1@gmail.com

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Ralph Hill  
<info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 3:35 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 27, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

Overall, it seems to me that the primary purpose of this project is to transfer a large quantity of money from the taxpayers to the construction contractors and water companies. I think this is a bad idea.

I strongly advocate putting this money and political effort into water conservation and recycling.

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

RECIRC2485

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Mr. Ralph Hill  
224 Dover St  
Los Gatos, CA 95032-3815  
ralphdhill@mac.com

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of KayLynn Newhart <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 3:43 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 27, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

.The intrusion of saltwater will only increase in the Delta with the advent of ocean rise expected in the future due to global warming impacts. Has this been considered in this plan?

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

RECIRC2486

Ms. KayLynn Newhart  
3623 Wamego Rd  
Placerville, CA 95667-6203  
knewhart@cdpr.ca.gov

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Marc Lawrence <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 3:38 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 27, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

(.We need to stop trying to destroy the delta and we need to invest in rain catchment systems! )

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

REC102487

Mr. Marc Lawrence  
16404 Ardath Ave  
Torrance, CA 90504-1821  
mjlawrence@sbcglobal.net



---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Howard Cohen <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 3:39 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 27, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

Water must be preserved by banning fracking in California and also by charging mega-agricultural users the fair market price of this resource.

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

REC12458

Sincerely,

Dr. Howard Cohen  
3272 Cowper St  
Palo Alto, CA 94306-3004  
howard@cohensw.com

---

**From:** Friends of the River <info@friendsoftheriver.org> on behalf of Matt Richardson <info@friendsoftheriver.org>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 27, 2015 3:47 PM  
**To:** BDCPcomments  
**Subject:** I oppose all alternatives in the Revised BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta

Oct 27, 2015

BDCP Comments

Dear Comments,

Thank you for receiving public comments in response to the Recirculated Draft BDCP Plan and Draft EIR/EIS.

I oppose all alternatives in the BDCP that propose construction of new diversions and tunnels under the Delta. I oppose the project because:

It is too costly (up to \$54 billion with interest and other hidden costs) and the general public should not have to cover any of this outrageous, including habitat restoration costs. These should be paid by those who receive the water (since the Delta diversions degraded the habitat in the first place).

Operation of the diversions and tunnels threaten to dewater major upstream reservoirs in northern California and reduce downstream river flows, to the detriment of fish, wildlife, recreation, and other public trust values.

Diversion and tunnel facilities would adversely impact too much Delta farmland and habitat, harm Brannan Island State Park, infringe on the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, and degrade other essential conservation lands.

You cannot restore Delta habitat without first determining how much fresh water the Delta needs to survive and thrive. Restoration of fresh water flows from the San Joaquin River in the south Delta are particularly important.

The tunnels will need more upstream storage facilities to feed fresh water into them. These include raising Shasta Dam, building the Sites Reservoir, and possibly reviving the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Dos Rios Dam on the Eel. The environmental, cultural, and financial impacts of these controversial projects are a significant foreseeable but ignored impact of the BDCP.

( California voters said NO to delta tunnels / peripheral canal years ago. It is unacceptable. )

I believe that the Revised BDCP should have included, and I would support, an alternative that significantly reduces Delta exports and focuses instead on restoring habitat and threatened and endangered species in the Delta, improves Delta water quality by providing sufficient fresh water inflow from both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, and that includes a pragmatic plan to sustainably meeting California's water needs. This can be done by increasing agricultural and urban water use efficiency, capturing and treating storm water, recycling urban waste water, cleaning up polluted groundwater, and reducing irrigation of desert lands in the southern Central Valley with severe drainage problems. We don't need to build more dams or tunnels.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Mr. Matt Richardson  
1855 Green St  
San Francisco, CA 94123-4921  
richardson034@gmail.com

RECIRC 2489