

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1901	1	My husband and I would like to add our names to the list of people living in San Joaquin County who are very much opposed to the Governor's plan for the "Delta Tunnels" project.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1901	2	At an estimated cost of \$15 billion, we feel this is an ill-conceived idea to address the state's water supply needs. This "Waterfix" project does not provide any new water, and could severely impact our Delta communities. This Delta region is home to nearly 4 million people, including 2,500 farmers who depend on water to provide the crops that contribute \$2 billion to California's economy each year.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project, and Master Response 5 regarding costs and implementation. As described in Impact ECON-6 under Alternative 4A in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, construction of conveyance facilities would convert land from existing agricultural uses to project-related construction uses, and agricultural land could also be affected by changes in water quality and other conditions that would affect crop productivity. These direct effects on agricultural land are described under Impacts AG-1 and AG-2 in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources. Total value of irrigated crop production in the Delta would decline on average by \$5.3 million per year during the construction period, with total irrigated crop acreage declining by about 4,700 acres. Other effects related to production costs, travel time, and loss of investments in production facilities and standing orchards and vineyards would also occur as a result of facilities construction. When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the alternative. When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the alternative.
1901	3	Drawing water from the Sacramento River to feed through these tunnels and divert to the south can only cause further harm to our needed water supply in this area, and can cause further harm to the unique and fragile Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta area. We urge you to not carry through with this project when our water issues are already so tenuous in this very important region.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.
1902	1	There is no way that this is a good idea (unless you are a big agribusiness supporter).	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. 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. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
1903	1	Your primary duty is to protect the people and the environment. That does not include pandering to the financial interests of unforesightful [sic], greedy and sociopathic corporations. Do your job.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The documentation generated by this proposed project has undergone extensive public and scientific input, discussion, and transparency, including the posting of administrative draft chapters online and providing many more opportunities for public participation than is normally required by the CEQA/NEPA processes (see Master Response 41 [Transparency]). Please also refer to Master Response 5, which details the proposed governance structure and implementation for the project. Socioeconomic effects of the alternatives are assessed in Chapter 16 of the Draft EIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1904	1	Just say no to the Delta tunnels project, another favor for big agriculture!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of 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> <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. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
1905	1	It's not the right solution!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of 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>
1906	1	Please reject the twin water tunnels as a "solution" to the state's water crises. Instead of building more flawed infrastructure, California should allocate more flows to waterways now, before fish species become extinct. We must recognize the rights of rivers to flow with clean water and the rights of fish to swim and thrive. It's crucial that we support waterways' right in law, and begin to implement sound solutions for California's water needs.	<p>The proposed project is not being advocated as the ultimate solution to the state's water crises. Rather, it 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. 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 proposed project. The California WaterFix 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>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 to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.</p>
1907	1	This is a project that should never happen, and it [is] no help to the communities that the water is taken from. This project will cause more harm than benefits.	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.
1908	1	Another dream of our dear Governor which is not only idiotic but another scheme to accommodate his contributors in Southern California. Please help to void this nonsense and accept my vote against it since it is an economic disaster and an insult to Northern California voters.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1909	1	Instead of sucking the Delta dry to support more theme parks, water fountains and housing in Southern California, I submit it is about time to build desalinization plants to support California needs. For years, the obvious has been pushed out due to political support of special interests. Do what is needed for California -- desalinization plants.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
1910	1	How about using that 15 billion dollars for more water storage? The tunnels will not store more water. California needs more water storage!	Please see Master Response 37 regarding water storage.
1911	1	No Delta tunnel! Because it will never do any good [and] never improve our water problem. So why [throw] good money down a [hole]? I would like to know how many cubic feet the tunnel would hold, before a drop comes out the other end. Where is that water going to come from [when] we are in a drought? If there is no water -- because we are in a drought -- to put in the tunnel, then which politicians are being paid off? Follow the money.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
1911	2	I have a plan. There is an ocean beside California. Take that water! Remove the salt -- this is called desalination. With the steam spin a magneto this will make electricity, which will pay for everything. Condense the steam to fresh water and pump it into the cities next to the ocean, San Francisco, Los Angeles and San Diego to start with. This is what is done in Huntington Beach at Edison Drive for the last seventy years. Another resource is our military. They have been using desalination to get fresh water from the Persian Gulf. I have added pictures below to better help you understand. Also, there is a link to [a] YouTube video of a private company building a desalination plant in San Diego which will make 50,000,000 gallons of reliable fresh water every day. Why not build 15 desalination plants with the money from the Delta tunnels? Something the people of California would support. http://www.cbsnews.com/news/california-ocean-desalination-plant-drinking-water-in-san-diego/	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. 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. Today, desalination creates an estimated 84,000 acre-feet of potable water a year in the state, mostly 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. 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. 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. Please see Master Response 7 regarding desalination.
1911	3	[ATT1: Map of "Location of the Pacific Ocean to the location of California which needs Water."]	This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
1911	4	[ATT2: Map of "Huntington Beach, California, where the Edison Power Plants are that use desalination."]	This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
1912	1	We need our water in the delta, central valley, for local farms, food, wildlife and commerce our needs are important too.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1912	2	Let the gluttons down there spend their \$\$\$\$ on desalinization plants and conserve as we are trying to do.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
1913	1	I live in delta area, I rely on clean fresh water for drinking and recreation, and the salinity rates are now detected 50 miles from the ocean. My water rate is increasing every month. I am observing lots of lush green golf courses, parks and estates, what will happen if the tunnels are built? It is not worth it. Spend the \$ on desalination plants for the shallow who want to keep their desert green.	<p>Salinity in the Delta is a function of the amount and timing of freshwater input from the major tributaries, tidal action from San Francisco Bay, and exports from the Delta. During the late winter and spring months of seasonally elevated flows, and in wet years, seawater intrusion is limited and the Delta has mostly low salinity. During low-flow summer and fall months, and during dry years, lower freshwater flows result in greater amounts of seawater intrusion. Staff from DWR and USBR constantly monitor Delta water quality conditions and adjust operations of the SWP and CVP in real time as necessary to meet water quality objectives set by the State Water Resource Control Board protection of agricultural water supply, municipal and industrial drinking water supply, and fish and wildlife beneficial uses. See section 4.3.4 for a discussion on the proposed projects effects on water quality, salinity and electrical conductivity.</p> <p>Effects of the alternatives on salinity levels are described in Chapter 8, Water Quality, and Appendix 8H, Electrical Conductivity, EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Modeling results indicate that the implementation of the water conveyance facilities may positively or adversely affect in-Delta water quality, depending on a number of factors including location, time of year, and hydrologic conditions. See tables in Appendices 8E through 8N for specific results related to various water quality constituents (including bromide and chloride).</p> <p>In addition to potential effects associated with the project and alternatives, modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the proposed project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.</p> <p>For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.</p>
1914	1	Please do not build the twin tunnels. It would be a disaster for our Delta and the entire region. I would prefer to see more water storage, desalination, and conservation.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
1915	1	How innocuous and even pleasant the term 'twin tunnels' sounds - but it isn't - because the delta is one of the largest in the nation and very important to the environmental health of a wide swath of California. The pressure of oceanic water and tides against the pressure of water running naturally downhill to sea level, has created a complex natural environment in which many people (and animals, plants, fish, etc.) live, work and play; it is the natural drain for the Sierra and rivers running from northern California to the sea. The delta has survived countless changes, including drought but will not survive in a sustained, artificial drought. It will not thrive if the habitat is changed swiftly and permanently, this change will not benefit Northern California and, in the long run not Southern California either. This is just the old 'peripheral canal' changed to tunnels. It wasn't good then and is not good now.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Please refer to Master Response 36, which explains how the California WaterFix Project is different from the previously proposed Peripheral Canal.
1915	2	The tunnels are not needed in my estimation, they will not help with the safety of our levees (how could Gov. Brown even think or say that is beyond me) because the pressure of water	Please see Chapter 2, FEIR/EIS, for the BDCP/CWF purpose and need, and Appendix 6A Sections 6A.2 and 6A.3 for discussion on existing levee improvement programs and funding mechanisms, which would not be

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		on the levees will not decrease - he forgot (or didn't know) that ocean water is heavier (as well as tidal)and the pressure it can exert much stronger than fresh water and the tunnels when operating will simply decrease the flow of fresh water and the ocean waters will simply replace the missing fresh water making the briny delta waters more and more salty and affecting wells and aquifers in a negative way - and not just in this part of California.	affected by the BDCP/CWF. While under the proposed project 50% of diverted water would come from the north Delta Diversion, DWR will still be required to comply with existing and future environmental regulations, including salinity standards to protect Delta water quality. Generally, the greatest diversions at the north Delta pumping facilities would occur in wetter years with higher flows to minimize and avoid potential effects to fish species and Delta water quality. In addition, see the Chapter 5 figures which indicate Delta outflow under the proposed project will be similar to Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative (NAA) baseline conditions. For more information on water quality and effects to groundwater in the Delta, please see Chapter 8, Water Quality, and Chapter 7, Groundwater in the FEIR/EIS.
1915	3	No one in my family is in agriculture in California, but I grew up on San Francisco Bay and have spent almost all of my life no further away than I am now. I do not believe the residents of any of the counties surrounding the Bay Area, San Pablo Bay and Suisun Bay and into the delta, have any idea of what will happen if the tunnels are ever built and used. We need to keep all this area surrounding the delta, the bays and including Northern California, and perhaps even to the south of us, informed of the negative impact these tunnels will make on their wine industries, fisheries, the water they drink, the gardens they grow, the food that grows in our valley - more than I can even enumerate. Even Sonoma and Napa Valley will be impacted as heavier water pushes its way into aquifers, rivers and wells.	Salinity in the Delta is a function of the amount and timing of freshwater input from the major tributaries, tidal action from San Francisco Bay, and exports from the Delta. During the late winter and spring months of seasonally elevated flows, and in wet years, seawater intrusion is limited and the Delta has mostly low salinity. During low-flow summer and fall months, and during dry years, lower freshwater flows result in greater amounts of seawater intrusion. Staff from DWR and USBR constantly monitor Delta water quality conditions and adjust operations of the SWP and CVP in real time as necessary to meet water quality objectives set by the State Water Resource Control Board protection of agricultural water supply, municipal and industrial drinking water supply, and fish and wildlife beneficial uses. See section 4.3.4 for a discussion on the proposed projects effects on water quality, salinity and electrical conductivity. Effects of the alternatives on salinity levels are described in Chapter 8, Water Quality. Modeling results indicate that the implementation of the water conveyance facilities may positively or adversely affect in-Delta water quality, depending on a number of factors including location, time of year, and hydrologic conditions. See tables in Appendices 8E through 8N for specific results related to various water quality constituents (including bromide and chloride). In addition to potential effects associated with the project and alternatives, modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the proposed project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.
1915	4	With brinier water, how will the wine industry survive? Any industry that depends on wells and the aquifer? Our fisheries will suffer and the impact of lack of fresh water will be felt into the nearby ocean, possibly as far or further than the Farallon Islands and change habitat forever.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The potential for water conveyance operations to affect salinity conditions in the Delta (including Suisun Marsh) under existing conditions and future no action conditions, and with implementation of each project alternative (including conservation measures), is assessed in detail in Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the EIR/EIS for the salinity-related parameters chloride (Impact WQ-7) and electrical conductivity (Impact WQ-11). Where significant impacts to water quality would occur due to the alternative, mitigation to lessen those impacts is provided.
1915	5	This idea is not a small thing and I understand our governor does not even want to pass environmental standards nor do an EIR. If that is true - why? Can it be that he doesn't want to know or doesn't want to contend with it but rather to just push and shove the tunnels to completion like his train no matter what the people living in that area think or want?	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
1915	6	The tunnels are a terrible idea one of the worst I have heard in my life for our area. A much simpler and less costly and certainly fairer solution would be that Southern California build adequate reservoirs to catch their monsoon rains or other ideas which I am sure someone can come up with - to resolve their water problems, there is no reason for them to expect or	It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		get more water from Northern California.	<p>(Demand Management) for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Additional water storage was eliminated from consideration in the Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS through the alternatives development and screening process (discussed in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives). As such, the proposed project does not propose storage as a project component. Although the proposed project would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, Alternative 4A is a stand-alone project which demonstrates independent utility just as future storage projects would demonstrate. Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives) and 56 (Storage) for additional information.</p> <p>The plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Although the project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented California Waterfix project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports), Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply) for further information.</p>
1915	7	No matter what is said or agreed to if there is a compromise, it is probable that agreement would not last and Southern California will get their way and our water. We must not let them be built - remember the Owens Valley - farm land watered by the water that existed in their area. LA came and made promises and took their water - it is no longer fertile farm land. I realize that is then and now is now and things have changed but this is way too important to all of California to just let it happen. Stop the tunnels! Save our water and our fish and aquatic animals and the way of life on the Delta. That is only fair - to force this on the people who actually live on or near this great estuary that is the delta and on the bays, the rivers and streams of the Sierra Nevada and northern California is a dirty deal for all of us. Let those of us who live here vote!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.
1916	1	<p>I have been against this plan ever since Governor Brown initiated the new tunnels to send more of our water to Southern California; read Los Angeles, et al.</p> <p>Southern California has received more rain over the past two years than this whole Central California Basin.</p> <p>Southern California needs to build water conservation methods of its own. They need to build desalination plants just as San Diego has begun.</p> <p>They waste more water than the whole of the Central Valley uses with their golf courses, swimming pools and lush lawns.</p> <p>The wealthy down there will not even conserve.</p> <p>WHY are we sending more water down there?</p> <p>I am totally against sending anymore of our precious resource for their use.</p> <p>Look at what Los Angeles did to the Owens Valley. Are we going to allow this same thing to</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 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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>happen here?</p> <p>I emailed Governor Brown to this effect months ago, using the email address shown online. Of course, it went "undeliverable". He will never accede to the people on this issue and I have voted for him in the past.</p> <p>Stop the water going to Southern California.</p>	<p>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. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.</p>
1917	1	<p>Besides the cost factor of the tunnels, where is the water coming from to fill these tunnels?</p> <p>Simply put, we don't have a secure, year in, year out, source.</p>	<p>The preferred alternative, Alternative 4A, proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances in which hydrological conditions result in availability of sufficient water and ecological objectives are fully satisfied. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under the preferred alternative would be about the same as the average annual amount of water that would be diverted under the No Action Alternative (i.e. 2025 conditions without the preferred alternative).</p>
1917	2	<p>Rather than enormous tunnels, we need dams and reservoirs to contain the water when we get it. From what I have seen with this bill, there is minimal storage within the framework. Lake Shasta and Oroville Dam cannot be the spigot for the whole state. It won't work.</p> <p>If more dams or reservoirs are not in the picture, then it is time to look at the ocean for water that can be desalted and made available to the public.</p>	<p>It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Additional water storage was eliminated from consideration in the Draft EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS through the alternatives development and screening process (discussed in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives). As such, the proposed project does not propose storage as a project component. Although the proposed project would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, Alternative 4A is a stand-alone project which demonstrates independent utility just as future storage projects would demonstrate.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives), Master Response 37 (Storage), and Master Response 7 (Desalination) for additional information.</p>
1918	1	<p>For decades, California's population and economy have benefited immensely from the huge infrastructure investments made by our predecessors. In particular, we are the recipients of water for drinking and other uses thanks to the construction of the State Water Project some 40 to 50 years ago.</p> <p>It's time for that infrastructure to be upgraded. Past time, actually, as the recent drought has so amply demonstrated. Pumping from the Delta pulls in brackish water and wildlife, damaging its ecosystem.</p>	<p>This comment is on the merits of the project. 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.</p>
1918	2	<p>A much better alternative is to wheel the water south around the Delta. This also reduces energy use, as the system can be gravity-fed rather than pump-driven like the current State</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Water Project delivery system. Let's move forward with this important and beneficial project. California's future depends on a reliable and sustainable source of fresh water, and the Bay Delta Conservation Plan (Alternative 4A) delivers.	
1919	1	I am totally against this "Delta Tunnel" supposed fix. This idea is like a child suggesting they want what they want only because they want it. No true research has been done; it is only a short tunnel, with huge damaging impact on our Delta area. California needs to do more conservation efforts to save water. Subdivisions need to rule out lawns [and] fountains, [and] we need to recycle used water for landscaping. These tunnels will cause huge silt buildups elsewhere; it is not a practical suggestion at all! There are so many other less expensive, less impactful ways to implement water conservation efforts.	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. 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 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 additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.
1919	2	For the money being spent, California could build a salt water conversion plant. We could use the rapidly encroaching ocean to convert for more water usage, build long lasting jobs and be a positive impact for Southern California and be beneficial to Northern California as well.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.
1919	3	Please, people, provide a more practical, less expensive solution. Governor Brown should politely stay out of issues he has no understanding of. We do not need to build two, let alone one, short tunnel with no return but to damage our unique environment. It will not prevent future flooding issues, not provide any new water needs, spend huge amount of taxpayer dollars, [and] hugely negatively impact our precious Sacramento River. This is a ludicrous idea and needs to be abandoned before we spend any more money or time on the issue.	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. 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 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 additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. 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 more information regarding costs of implementing the proposed project and regarding funding.
1920	1	The proposed Delta Tunnels is just another veiled attempt similar to the Peripheral Canal that Jerry Brown and his cronies tried to get passed when he was governor the first time around. Nobody profits from these so-called "fixes" more than the corporate behemoth, Westlands Water District. These so-called "fixes" are always at the expense of the Northern California citizens to benefit big business such as Westlands Water District, and their bought	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 proposed project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully implemented project would be about the same as the

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>and paid for politicians that they control. Siphoning more fresh water from our already fragile Delta is not going to help the health of our region and only contribute to more non-native water hyacinth proliferation demise of wild salmon, steelhead, and Delta smelt, as well as greater saltwater intrusion from San Francisco Bay.</p> <p>The bottom line is we need every bit of fresh water to flush through our Delta to keep it healthy.</p> <p>No amount of taking more fresh water away is going to help, it simply doesn't add up.</p>	<p>average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports). Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> <p>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 (Peripheral Canal) for more information. Refer also to Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).</p>
1920	2	<p>Why not have some real "fixes" for Southern California's lack of fresh water such as permanent solar powered desalination plants? If we built them along the Southern coast and interior valley areas, this would actually help provide more fresh water during these inevitable drought periods that historically happen.</p> <p>The folks that benefit from the new and "renewable source" of fresh water could help pay for it rather than business as usual by taking from the Northern California area to benefit the Southern California big businesses and politicians.</p>	<p>It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 (Demand Management) for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives) and Master Response 7 (Desalination) for additional information.</p>
1920	3	<p>No wonder why there are folks who complain about taxation without representation such as those who support the "State of Jefferson". It seems to be much too common in this day and age.</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1920	4	<p>Let's try a more common sense approach and stop the pillaging of our fragile Delta to benefit the corporate entities such as Westlands Water District and their cronies.</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. It is not the result of "favoring" large corporations (e.g., large agribusinesses). In fact, this issue is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have local land use/zoning authority. See Master Response 45 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 43 (Beneficial Use of Water), Master Response 44 (Change in Delta Exports), and Master Response 51 (Southern California Water Supply).</p>
1921	1	<p>Governor Brown's "water fix" plan for the giant water tunnels is merely a water grab. He wants to ship northern California water to southern California.</p> <p>This is not a water fix. It would destroy the delicate marshes and delta of the Sacramento River. He must be stopped now.</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p>
1921	2	<p>There are many ways of getting water into California and this is not one of them. More dams need to be built. Also, JFK, when he was alive in the 60's, formulated a plan and maps to pipe excess snow and ice water from Alaska into California and Texas. These pipes could have already been built at minimal cost and still could be built. This was over 40 years ago! I'll bet the maps are still on file somewhere in the federal archives. Also, desalination</p>	<p>While water storage is a critically important tool for managing California's water resources, it is not a topic that must be addressed in the EIR/EIS for the proposed project. This is because the proposed project does not, and need not, propose storage as a project component. Although the physical facilities contemplated by the proposed project, once up and running, would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, the proposed project is a stand-alone project for purposes of</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		would work. This goes on everywhere and would not be as costly as destroying the delta and the neighboring farms and wildlife marshes that depend on the Sacramento and American Rivers.	CEQA and NEPA, just as future storage projects would be. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, of the FEIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage. Please see Master Response 4 regarding the development of alternatives. Please see Master Response 6 for information on Demand Management. Please see Master Response 37 regarding water storage.
1922	1	I strongly oppose diverting water from the delta and or the Sacramento River. This diversion would have a devastating effect on the environment and way of life for those living around the delta, and possibly in the future, all of us who in live in the immediate area. The Kern County Water Agency and the Westlands Water District, need to come up with a better plan to conserve and protect the water in their own area.	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 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 proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project. Please also refer to Master Response 4(Alternatives), Master Response 34 (Delta Reform Act), Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), and Master Response 24 (Delta as a Place).
1922	2	The tax payers of California should not be obligated to bare the burden of construction, financing, operation and environmental mitigation of these tunnels. In a tough economy, taxpayers can only afford to pay so much. Thus, we should invest in fixing our failing local infrastructure, not helping finance a project that will change the way of life for those in the area, and benefiting corporate interest. Do not allow this travesty to happen!	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. 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 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 additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. 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 more information regarding costs of implementing the proposed project and funding.
1923	1	It seems like Jerry Brown is doing his best to ruin Northern California. What a waste of money, like the stupid train. We have enough saltwater intrusion; we don't need to increase	Salinity in the Delta is a function of the amount and timing of freshwater input from the major tributaries, tidal action from San Francisco Bay, and exports from the Delta. During the late winter and spring months of

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		the problem.	<p>seasonally elevated flows, and in wet years, seawater intrusion is limited and the Delta has mostly low salinity. During low-flow summer and fall months, and during dry years, lower freshwater flows result in greater amounts of seawater intrusion. Staff from DWR and USBR constantly monitor Delta water quality conditions and adjust operations of the SWP and CVP in real time as necessary to meet water quality objectives set by the State Water Resource Control Board protection of agricultural water supply, municipal and industrial drinking water supply, and fish and wildlife beneficial uses. See section 4.3.4 for a discussion on the proposed projects effects on water quality, salinity and electrical conductivity.</p> <p>Effects of the alternatives on salinity levels are described in Chapter 8, Water Quality, and Appendix 8H, Electrical Conductivity, EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Modeling results indicate that the implementation of the water conveyance facilities may positively or adversely affect in-Delta water quality, depending on a number of factors including location, time of year, and hydrologic conditions. See tables in Appendices 8E through 8N for specific results related to various water quality constituents (including bromide and chloride).</p> <p>Modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the proposed project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.</p>
1924	1	I do not support the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix (Delta Tunnels) and hope this plan will be re-evaluated to find better use and or fixes for the current situation.	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.
1925	1	I don't support the Delta plan. I am a Manteca resident. It's not best for the community.	The Lead Agencies discuss community character in Chapter 16 of the EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A (Socioeconomics) identifies the unique features of the Delta and describes the potential effects on Delta communities.
1926	1	I am taking time as a very concerned citizen and voter in Northern California to express my deepest concern over the proposed Delta Tunnel water project. The project is based, in my opinion, on unrealistic expectation as to the future water supply. Northern California is already being water rationed and farmers who rely on Delta water are being limited as to their use at this time. To divert a massive amount of water away from the Northern California Delta area will have a devastating impact of the agricultural economy and ultimately the entire economic base of the central California area. This bill must not be passed.	<p>DWR and Reclamation are preparing an EIR/EIS. At this time, there is no legislation related to approval of the EIR/EIS. In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S.</p> <p>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 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, Water Demand Management).</p>
1927	1	In my opinion the twin tunnel project does not fix anything. What it does do is allow for massive water shipments to big corporate growers that don't even use all the water, but resell it at a profit. It doesn't take a genius to realize the shortage of fresh water flowing into the Delta will allow for salt intrusion and ruin the local farms and fishing industry.	<p>In the State of California, all water belongs to the people of the state; and water rights are issued as rights to use the water for reasonable and beneficial uses. The proposed project would not affect upstream water rights.</p> <p>For both environmental and economic reasons, there is an urgent need to improve and modernize the existing SWP/CVP conveyance system, which was designed and built decades ago. The ecological problems</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		I urge you to scrap this massive waste of money.	<p>with the current system could be greatly reduced by the construction and use of new north Delta intake structures with state-of-the-art fish screens. With this future vision in mind, DWR and several state and federal water contractors, in coordination with the Bureau of Reclamation, proposed a strategy for restoring ecological functions in the Delta while improving water supply reliability in California.</p> <p>Since 2006, the BDCP/California WaterFix has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 5 for a discussion on water needs.</p>
1928	1	<p>As a native Californian I have been blessed with over 50 years of working on and around our Delta. It is one of the rarest, richest places on the planet to live. I have seen the changes that have taken place in it. Most of them [are] not good. It is lifeblood to our state's unique economy and lifestyle. The envy of nations around the world.</p> <p>The tunnel project is shortsighted tampering with this fragile resource.</p> <p>For posterity's sake pray that it doesn't come about.</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.</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 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 additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
1929	1	I believe the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix is not the solution to California's water problem. I believe it will severely impact the Delta region to its detriment. California needs a better solution. I do not support this plan at all.	<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 to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
1930	1	We strongly oppose this Delta Tunnels project. The cost is way out of hand and the water is needed where it's at now for farmers who contribute a lot of money to our state. Money in is better than all this money out and I strongly suspect it is for the benefit of Southern California. No on this for us.	DWR acknowledges your opposition to the project. Please see Master Response 5 regarding cost and funding of the proposed project.
1931	1	<p>Do not vote to build the three proposed water intakes and the proposed Delta tunnels. Our local water resources are too important to send south.</p> <p>Our Delta waterways are under enough strain.</p> <p>Our Delta cities would be adversely affected.</p> <p>Farmers, recreational enthusiasts, cities, and wildlife would suffer.</p> <p>The cost is too high; the end result is not a good investment.</p> <p>This proposal does nothing to address Northern California's water needs.</p>	<p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Stop this from happening, please!	
1932	1	I am in receipt of the flyer on the above captioned. I am not in favor of this plan. The U.S. government already told the State of California to not go ahead with this. It would cause harm to the fragile Sacramento/San Joaquin delta. Vote against this.	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.
1933	1	Please do not go ahead with the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix. This project could cause further damage to the fragile Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
1933	2	At an estimated cost of \$15 billion we deserve a better solution. The WaterFix does not provide even one drop of new water.	DWR acknowledges your opposition to the project. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
1934	1	I am writing this in complete opposition to the twin tunnel projects. This is a bad idea for Northern California. We are already in a drought and our Delta needs to be protected and preserved. My entire family and friends are all against Gov. Browns project and would love to see a stop to this madness. Just take a good look at Mono Lake and what happened there to see what could happen here if he gets his way. My husband did a report on the Mono Lake area when he was in grade school. At one time it was a flourishing community. Because of Southern California taking its water away it was destroyed. Please do not let this happen to us. You do not take water from us and send it to a desert...This is madness.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
1935	1	As a longtime San Joaquin resident and registered voter, I say no to the tunnels! We can come up with a better solution to our water needs. This area feeds a huge part of our country and probably needs to enable the farmers to water crops. Plus why is it necessary to mess up the Delta's ecosystem and its beautiful waterways? Please use common sense and your heart not your wallet!	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. 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 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 additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.
1936	1	I have lived in Vacaville nearly every year since the Air Force brought me to Travis AFB in 1965. Water has been a topic of discussion before 1965 as the book Cadillac Desert illustrates. The MWD [Metropolitan Water District] virtually destroyed the Owens Valley when it purchased water rights in the valley. Building these giant tunnels will do the same to the San Francisco Bay. You cannot be ignorant of the vast destruction already caused by salt water intrusion further up the Delta than it originally reached. This is not a natural happening, but is caused by the overdraw of water from the system. There is no "surplus" of water flowing through the Delta. How do the proposed tunnels comply with the "watershed of origin" doctrine? Having served 10 years on the Solano County Habitat Conservation Plan steering committee, I see this idea as just another Southern California	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards. The range of alternatives in the EIR/EIS includes alternatives which result in reductions in SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta as compared to the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		monstrous water grab.	The No Action Alternative and Alternatives 4H1, 4H2, 4H3, 4H4; 5; 6A, 6B, 6C; 7; 8; and 9 would result in less SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta than under Existing Conditions (shown in Tables 5-5 and 5-8). Similarly, Alternatives 6A, 6B, 6C; 7; 8; and 9 would result in less SWP and CVP water deliveries south of the Delta than under the No Action Alternative (shown in Tables 5-6 and 5-9). However, SWP and CVP water deliveries would continue under all alternatives.
1937	1	I must comment on the proposed twin tunnels to take water from the Sacramento River and send it to Southern California. I don't understand how this can be good for the Delta, as with less water, more ocean water will travel further up the river, increasing salinity for the Delta farmers. How can less water be helpful to the animals, birds, and fish that rely on it now? They are struggling with less water now due to the drought. How can the many billions of dollars proposed, with probable cost overruns, be cost-effective? Does anyone know how much it will really cost? Does anyone know how much water will be diverted? If someone does, there hasn't been information put out on this. As a taxpayer, I am totally against this plan. The science does not seem to be complete. Logic says there is only so much water and so much money and this does not seem to be a positive way to solve the water shortage problems that California has. There does not seem to be anyone in charge of this plan, anyone who will provide oversight. Who will provide oversight? There does seem to be a small committee that has formulated this plan without much taxpayer or legislative input. How can a small group of people make such a huge decision for all of California? All the Delta-area legislators and cities are against this plan. I'm sure many people are against this plan. I am. A lot of people are against things but don't take the time to give their input. That is a shame.	Salinity in the Delta is a function of the amount and timing of freshwater input from the major tributaries, tidal action from San Francisco Bay, and exports from the Delta. During the late winter and spring months of seasonally elevated flows, and in wet years, seawater intrusion is limited and the Delta has mostly low salinity. During low-flow summer and fall months, and during dry years, lower freshwater flows result in greater amounts of seawater intrusion. Staff from DWR and USBR constantly monitor Delta water quality conditions and adjust operations of the SWP and CVP in real time as necessary to meet water quality objectives set by the State Water Resource Control Board protection of agricultural water supply, municipal and industrial drinking water supply, and fish and wildlife beneficial uses. See section 4.3.4 for a discussion on the proposed projects effects on water quality, salinity and electrical conductivity. Effects of the alternatives on salinity levels are described in Chapter 8, Water Quality, and Appendix 8H, Electrical Conductivity, EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS. Modeling results indicate that the implementation of the water conveyance facilities may positively or adversely affect in-Delta water quality, depending on a number of factors including location, time of year, and hydrologic conditions. See tables in Appendices 8E through 8N for specific results related to various water quality constituents (including bromide and chloride). For more information regarding cost of the proposed project please see Master Response 5.
1937	2	This tunnel plan makes no sense! Please go back to the drawing board and devise a plan to store water that falls in the winter, when it does, so it's available in the summer. There are plenty of storage places in this huge state. I do not see how the tunnels cannot ruin the Delta which is so important to our area and to the farmers and wildlife that depend on the water here.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. For information regarding why additional storage was not considered in the proposed project refer to Master Response 37 (Water Storage). Please refer to Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 34 for additional details on the determination of beneficial use. Additionally, please refer to Master Response 24 for details on the Delta as a place and the impacts of the proposed project on the Delta.
1938	1	I oppose the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/California WaterFix project. The reason is simple. I have a budget, and I do not invest in anything that will not produce an appropriate increase in my position after the investment. I don't see this project doing that. Please don't waste our hard-earned money -- there has to be a better way.	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 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 additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.
1939	1	It is appalling to consider putting tunnels under the San Francisco Bay-Delta to ship water, which is, or will soon be, inadequate to keep the Bay and the surroundings healthy. The cost, billions, is far too great for an inadequate and unreliable water supply, with the concomitant waste of energy and the evaporation that occurs en route south. Money should be used for the many innovative methods of saving and distributing water.	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. 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		I implore you to abandon this tunnel boondoggle!	statutory and contractual obligations. 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 additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.
1940	1	I am very much against any further changes to the present shipment of water to Southern California until much improvement in the capture and retention of rainwater in that area is completed.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Water delivered to the SWP and CVP water contractors participating in proposed project would be within the existing contract amounts to serve agricultural lands that have been cultivated and existing and planned community populations. As described in Chapter 5, Water Supply, of the EIR/S, it is anticipated that climate change would result in more frequent and more severe rainfall events and less snowfall than under historic conditions. These rainfall events would result in periods of time when the capacity of the existing intakes would not be adequate. Therefore, the proposed project would provide the maximum capacity in the intakes and tunnels during those periods of time to convey water during extremely wet periods to areas south of the Delta for storage and use during drier times. The proposed project would decrease total exports of SWP and CVP water as compared to Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative in the summer and early fall months; and increase flows in the wet winter months when the river flows are high to improve conditions for aquatic resources. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries in drier periods. The north Delta and south Delta intakes would only be used to divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements.</p> <p>The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. 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 with 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, Water Demand Management).</p>
1941	1	Simply -- no. It is destructive of our beautiful Delta and a huge waste of money.	<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.</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 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 additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
1942	1	The goal should be to increase the water saved in California, not taking water from one group to give to another. We need serious plans for more dams to save water and ways to divert flood water to help recharge the ground water supply. With global climate change, we will have less snow and more rain and floods. We need to capture as much of that flood water as possible.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. For information regarding why additional storage was not considered in the proposed project refer to Master Response 37 (Water Storage). Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives.
1942	2	When Davis was governor, we had to buy electricity out-of-state at high expense. The rest of the country looked on thinking: people in California were too stupid to plan for the future. They didn't build more power generation plants. Now they are getting what they	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.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		deserve. We need to plan for the future and we're already decades behind.	
1942	3	Let's try to save more of the water we get, not take it away from those who need it.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1943	1	Please do not pursue the water tunnels. It would be a disaster for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. There are better solutions for Southern California, like building desalination plants. Please stop taking our Northern California water. Stop the tunnels!	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. See Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply) and Master Response 7 (Desalination).
1945	1	I understand that the public comment period for the Delta tunnels ends on October 30, 2015. I'd like to speak my piece, and I believe government representation is obligated to make an informed decision representing the citizens. Maybe what drives Governor Brown to just say, 'Shut up" to his critics is the common sense spoken by the masses, making sense.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1945	2	I truly do not understand how we could proceed to decimate the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta region by merely shipping more water to Los Angeles. Much of my family lives in LA, I'm a Dodger fan for life, and I love the LA beaches . . . but their quest for water without responsible conservation is not Northern California's responsibility. Northern California is living with drought consequences daily, while Southern California consumes. Northern California will suffer. Farmers will suffer. California will suffer.	In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S. 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 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, Water Demand Management).
1945	3	We cannot afford the consequence of losing the Delta, and surely not now at this stage of the drought. Spend the money to pipe it from Alaska or more from Colorado, if you are looking for billions of dollars to spend.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
1946	1	I strongly oppose the Delta tunnels plan. It is completely foolish and short-sighted to attempt to fix one problem by creating another. Surely we can find a better solution.	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. Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. Please also refer to Master Response 4 (Tunnel Option), which addresses why the tunnel option was the only alternative optimized.
1947	1	Why would the government do this? It's wrong and cruel in so many unusual ways. Have a heart, Governor. Or forever hold your peace and go to hell. [Because] if this happens, millions will die of thirst, all [because] of your shameful [stupidity]. Plus, most or all	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		California's natural beauty will become a wasteland. Plus, no tourists or money. There go the [hundreds] of employees. This scenario will turn [into an] apocalyptic scene, and everyone will have to evacuate northward or further east.	<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 has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>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 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 additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
1948	1	Freshwater is needed in the Delta and San Francisco Bay to prevent saltwater intrusion.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of 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/EIS were raised.</p>
1949	1	Please do not allow this tunnel to be built, I have seen what business does to the environment in the Tampa Bay, Fl area. It isn't good. You start mucking with the environment, and next thing you know, you're having to do expensive things to mitigate the problems you've caused, because you didn't know all the consequences of what was being done.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria 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>
1950	1	California is truly at a crossroads with this project. This use of public subsidized water to support agribusiness and unsustainable growth in southern California at the cost of major environmental damage in the northern half of the state is unconscionable. There has to be a better way! The use of gray water for irrigation, conservation and holding agriculture accountable for the amount of the state's water they use (near 80%) are some of the more rational steps that need to be taken. A blank check is what Governor Brown would like to give these powers that be (developers and agribusiness). If the Governor thinks that this project is part of his "legacy," it might truly become that, but for all the wrong reasons!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of 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 regarding the range of alternatives selected. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1950	2	80% of California's water for big ag at ridiculously below-market prices is nuts. Enough.	<p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the range of alternatives selected. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1951	1	<p>We need better plans for water supply in California. This isn't safe or helpful to anyone but Big Agriculture. This idea would devastate the local ecology and harm already endangered species.</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>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S.</p> <p>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 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, Water Demand Management).</p>
1952	1	<p>Please do not proceed with this project. Agriculture can and must adjust to the changing climate. Destroying rivers and watersheds only exacerbates our problems. Our rivers and watersheds must be protected above all else. Our policy must be centered around protecting rivers and watersheds. Please see "The Russian River: All Rivers The Value of an American Watershed."</p> <p>It explains how our rivers have been destroyed by this kind of intervention and the very serious consequences of such unwise policy. Please, we cannot live without our rivers. Without watersheds, there is no life! Please consider your actions and prioritize saving and restoring watersheds for the sake of our children and generations to come.</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>In accordance with the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor any change in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p>
1953	1	<p>I am deeply disappointed with this "California Water Fix".</p> <p>While I realize that California is in a difficult position to solve the water problem, this solution appears to help only big agriculture and the Southern California residents with their</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>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		big swimming pools and lawns. I hope you'll oppose the Delta Tunnels Plan.	to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. 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 to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
1954	1	I am grateful that Governor Brown is working so hard to save our state. On the issue of the proposed Bay-Delta tunnels, however, I am staunchly opposed to this plan and feel it is an unsound strategy for fixing our water woes. Please do not allow this to go forward. Other options must be explored and will prove superior.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. 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.
1955	1	The tunnels would divert massive amounts of water, greatly reducing Sacramento River flows, the main source of fresh water for the Delta and San Francisco Bay. Most of this water would be diverted for industrial-scale agriculture.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. Senior water rights holders are not affected by implementation of action alternatives. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation would be able to pump from the proposed north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the proposed project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S. The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.
1956	1	You have done so well by us, but you need to rethink this proposal and wait for a better solution. I have always trusted your thinking so don't blow it.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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.
1957	1	This an absolutely horrible idea and huge waste of taxpayer money, including mine! Please give up on this dangerous plan that hurts our ecosystem and helps only Big Ag!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of 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>Funding for the construction and operation of the proposed water conveyance facility and its mitigation will be secured through financing by the participating state and federal water contractors described in the public draft EIR/EIS, chapter 8. This funding will come from water rate increases to the users of the water supplied by these participating water contractors. Taxpayers would not pay any costs of the proposed project.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 5 for more information on project costs and funding.</p>
1958	1	Let's support Small Ag instead: sustainable small organic farms, treating soil and food with deep respect and cutting-edge know-how, supporting CO2 sequestration in the process... We can stop global warming that way and we must! Let's also focus on creating efficient water storage solutions, instead of directing water away for the sake of Big Ag profits... That's the way to lead California into the future with confidence, wisdom and dignity! In the meantime, please stop nestle now from syphoning off California's water for pittens and turning around to make insane profits off of our water. That is just plain wrong! We thank you for your leadership, Governor Brown!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>For more information regarding climate change and GHGs please see Master Response 19.</p> <p>While water storage is a critically important tool for managing California's water resources, it is not a topic that must be addressed in the EIR/EIS for the proposed project. This is because the proposed project does not, and need not, propose storage as a project component. Although the physical facilities contemplated by the proposed project, once up and running, would be part of an overall statewide water system of which new storage could someday also be a part, the proposed project is a stand-alone project for purposes of CEQA and NEPA, just as future storage projects would be. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the development of alternatives. Please see Master Response 6 for information on Demand Management.</p>
1959	1	The Delta Tunnels Project is a monstrous idea. Jerry Brown may do some good actions for our environment, but this one would be a catastrophic nightmare. He needs to come to his senses and to get his ego out of the way on this one. This would be a bad legacy!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The 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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
1960	1	We don't have much left, and the Delta Tunnels/"CA Water Fix" will do more harm than good! Please oppose the delta tunnels!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
1961	1	Please don't destroy the Bay-Delta ecosystem by building these tunnels. Very bad idea.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>
1962	1	<p>Please do not destroy my state in the interest of funding wealthy agricultural conglomerates who are growing toxic food contributing to massive amounts of health issues in the American people these days.</p> <p>Stop 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.</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. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
1963	1	What good are these 'tunnels' going to be when we finally run dry?	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of 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>
1964	1	Governor Brown, why can't the almond growers lower their expectations?	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of 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>

RECIRC 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>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1965	1	<p>Water is a crucial and finite resource, which must be carefully and deeply considered. Diverting water from natural systems in order to grow almonds, pistachios, and other "luxury" foods is not wise. We will make everything worse in the future by building tunnels for water diversion. This is not the answer. We must change our values, our economic systems, and our approach to agriculture. Water is scarce and we must use utmost wisdom in our decisions.</p> <p>Please vote against the Delta tunnels project.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <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. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
1966	1	<p>Predictions are that Northern California will not receive much water again this next year. Let's not ruin the Delta waterways and all the habitat by draining and selling off islands to Southern California agencies.</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>
1967	1	<p>Why are we still pretending that it's okay to destroy the environment?</p> <p>The time for living dangerously is over. We need to get rid of farming that is not suitable for this environment rather than wasting scarce resources on 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>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</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. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
1968	1	<p>Think of the legacy of destruction you are going to leave when they tear up our Delta. This is not the solution for water. Go back to the drawing board.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. DWR's</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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 to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
1969	1	Please stop this, ban fracking, and stop Nestle from bottling and taking our water away!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to stipulated beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows. Fracking presumably would be an “industrial” use of water.</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>
1970	1	In the manner of humans, the industrial agriculturalists are resistant to changing their behavior. They wish to continue to cultivate water intensive crops in an arid climate region and to do so with my and other taxpayers' subsidization for no better reason than that is what they are already doing. It was their choice to do so. Protecting them from experiencing the consequences of their own actions is not the responsibility of the public and it is an impossibility. Let's not invest billions of dollars in an attempt to do the impossible. Let's not do the California water fix.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of 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> <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. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).</p>
1971	1	Major agriculture, agriculture that's built for industry and the only purpose of money. This is a fake reality, in order for humanity to actually live on and create new amazing sustaining ways of continued life, we have to progress. Creating new dams, and huge waterways that lead to major cities and big business agriculture will be the many small ends to the masses. It's sad to say or imagine that just because of "business" a piece of paper that was created	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		and given its identity by humanity can actually determine our demises. Make the right choice the real choice for all, and protect humanity and our resources, for they're the only ones we're given.	to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.
1972	1	If all of this were on the up and up, you wouldn't be keeping it on the down low. Stop it!	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1973	1	Stealing the north's water to send south so that Senator Fienstien's husband and his real estate cronies can grow the L.A. is an ecological crime against the state of California. This plan has been hidden for the last 10 years, but make no mistake, this is all about another water and land grab right out of the movie "China Town." And it's just about as scummy. As the saying goes "follow the \$," it's easy to see who's who in this water theft. Educate yourself about this issue, it is the biggest thing our state will be involved in for a long time out.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. 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. 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 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 additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. For more information regarding MWD Water Supply please see Master Response 35.
1974	1	This is just too expensive, and in the same way that landscapes are being changed to acknowledge the very reality of what truly thrives in certain environments, we must change our agricultural landscapes. We can not afford, financially and water-wise, the vastness of farms that need more watering than naturally occurs. Those landscapes need to be diminished, not eliminated, and certainly not expanded.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. 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. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water) and Master Response 5 (Cost

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			and Funding).
1975	1	I usually agree with our Governor, but not on this issue. No Delta tunnels project!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
1976	1	Please prioritize solutions aimed at prevention rather than immediate need. Respect the science of climate change and adjust solutions to meet this new reality. Thank you for your understanding and consideration.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of 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 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>More information on ways in which the California WaterFix proposes to improve resiliency and adaptability of the Delta to climate change can be found in Chapter 29, Climate Change, EIR/EIS and Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, EIR/EIS.</p>
1977	1	If big agriculture is such a boon and a valuable business, then it should be able to pay its own way.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of 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>
1978	1	We have to figure out a sustainable way to deal with this drought. . . Not by letting Big Agriculture continue to use massive amounts of water!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements.</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 long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			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, Water Demand Management). 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.
1979	1	This project is being railroad through by Governor Brown. There has not been a serious economic and scientific assessment of alternative strategies to get more water for the state. And the project could cost \$60 billion by the time it is paid for. Who is going to pay for 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>Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>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 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 additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
1979	2	How much smarter to recharge groundwater, replace leaky pipes, reuse water and practice conservation.	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 for additional details on demand management.
1979	3	For those who point to possible earthquake damage to the existing levees as reason to build the tunnels, there is now an overflight Lidar program that can help identify weak levees. The cost of rebuilding those levees is much less than building the tunnels. Moreover, did the Governor ever consider that the tunnels also would be vulnerable to earthquakes?	<p>The commenter raises the issues of using of LIDAR data to identify weak levees. The lead agencies are not aware of such a program, and suspect that the commenter may be referring to LIDAR data used to detect levees that have subsided.</p> <p>For more information regarding alternatives to the proposed project, such as rebuilding levees, please see Master Response 4.</p> <p>Regarding the part of the comment pertaining to the vulnerability to the tunnels to seismic events, please refer to the discussions under GEO-7 and GEO-8 in Chapter 9. Chapter 9 of the 2013 BDCP Draft EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS describes the geology and seismicity of the study area. Based on a review of the last 20 years of precast tunnel lining seismic performance histories, it can be concluded that little or no damage to precast tunnel lining was observed for major earthquakes around the world. Based on preliminary data, it is anticipated that the Delta tunnels can be designed to withstand anticipated seismic loads. Design-level geotechnical studies would be conducted to assess site-specific hazards and appropriate mitigation measures would be implemented. Impact GEO- 1 and GEO-7 discusses the possibility of loss or damage resulting from strong seismic activity during construction and operation of water conveyance features. For more information regarding tunnel design please see the 2013 Conceptual Engineering Report.</p> <p>Please see Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS for discussion of potential consequences of an earthquake to exports under a No Action scenario.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1980	1	We certainly have not done enough to employ alternative and environmental water sources. Divert resources to gray water, filtration and desalination. Let's be smart and not destroy one environment to benefit another.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of 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 for additional details on demand management.</p>
1981	1	<p>Please stop this ridiculous action. It's time to make Los Angeles build a desalination plant and leave our water in Northern California where it belongs.</p> <p>Save the salmon.</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 desalination please see Master Response 7.</p>
1982	1	Don't take our water! Get your own, Southern California! If you want more water than what naturally comes your way make it from seawater. The sooner we start building desalination plants the sooner we can stop squabbling over what fresh water nature provides.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of 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 desalination please see Master Response 7. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.</p>
1983	1	How about saving rainwater at the local level and not depending on snow pack? How about new irrigation and farming methods that no one adopts for a variety of reasons? How about some trickle down economics for the impoverished in the Central Valley.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of 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 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives.</p>
1984	1	<p>Diverting fresh water away from where it is intended (by God) to maintain a healthy Delta and San Francisco Bay estuary is morally wrong. It will further throw our environment out of balance, conceivably worsening global warming. Citing section 4 of Pope Francis' Laudato Si, On Care of Our Common Home, "the ecological concern [is] 'a tragic consequence' of unchecked human activity: Due to an ill-considered exploitation of nature, humanity runs the risk of destroying it and becoming in turn a victim of this degradation".</p> <p>I am categorically opposed to this proposal!</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 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>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			More information on ways in which the California WaterFix proposes to improve resiliency and adaptability of the Delta to climate change can be found in Chapter 29, Climate Change, EIR/EIS and Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, EIR/EIS.
1985	1	You need to take better care of the water you have -- and don't expect to get more from Arizona.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of 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 and other action alternatives were developed to continue operations of the SWP and CVP which use water from the Trinity River and Central Valley watersheds, not from the Colorado River which provides water to Arizona, southern California, and many other states. The proposed project and other action alternatives do not address changes in water supplies from the Colorado River. As stated in the Project Objectives and Purpose and Need (see Chapter 2 of the EIR/S), all of the action alternatives would continue the operation of the SWP and CVP in accordance with the existing water rights and regulatory criteria adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights or any changes in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation.</p> <p>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 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, Water Demand Management).</p>
1986	1	I simply do not understand how on Earth anyone could even conceive of a plan like this; it is not logical.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1986	2	We are talking about ruining public lands -- that we, the public own, fought for and paid for -- trespassing comes to mind.	This comment is on the merits of the project expressing the opinion that public lands will be ruined. 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 project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Further, construction effects for the preferred alternative have been greatly reduced for Alternative 4A, the preferred CEQA and NEPA alternative by reducing effects on private property and eliminate most of the land disturbance and conversions effects by constructing the project in tunnels under the Delta.
1986	3	The "rebuilding" is something that is not in the least realistic -- it took decades, no, centuries for the land to be as it is -- you cannot remake or repair the damage in "10 years."	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
1986	4	We are in earthquake country -- if you build something like this and we have a major earthquake in the south of the state, what happens to these concrete pipes full of water? They don't bend or stretch. Where will the water go then? How will the repairs be done? Will the land be yet again dug up to repair the damage?	Chapter 9 of the 2013 BDCP Draft EIR/EIS and Appendix A of the RDEIR/SDEIS describes the geology and seismicity of the study area. Based on a review of the last 20 years of precast tunnel lining seismic performance histories, it can be concluded that little or no damage to precast tunnel lining was observed for major earthquakes around the world. Based on preliminary data, it is anticipated that the Delta tunnels can be designed to withstand anticipated seismic loads. Design-level geotechnical studies would be conducted to assess site-specific hazards and appropriate mitigation measures would be implemented. Impact GEO- 1 and

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>GEO-7 discusses the possibility of loss or damage resulting from strong seismic activity during construction and operation of water conveyance features. For more information regarding tunnel design please see the 2013 Conceptual Engineering Report.</p> <p>Please see Appendix 3E, Potential Seismic and Climate Change Risks to SWP/CVP Water Supplies, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS for discussion of potential consequences of an earthquake to exports under a No Action scenario.</p>
1986	5	Saltwater intrusion into the Delta -- very similar effects as the defunct Cross Florida Barge Canal would have created in Florida if it weren't for Marjorie Harris Carr and the Florida Defenders of the Environment. We cannot afford to have our rivers end up like the Colorado has -- not even making it to the ocean anymore.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
1986	6	I also understand that some "agencies" have sold land in the Delta around Rio Vista to some of the interested Southern California water businesses. They best not be selling/shifting around the land that belongs to the public or adjacent to public lands that would harm the delicate balance of the environment in the Delta.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
1986	7	If Governor Brown wants to leave a legacy he should do as Vic Fazio did -- save the beautiful, necessary Delta and let our rivers flow as they are.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
1986	8	Garamendi is correct when he talks about alternatives like building storage -- for goodness sake, there is plenty of land in the Central Valley that could hold a large reservoir for the farming.	Please see Master Response 37 regarding water storage.
1986	9	And who will really benefit by this water? Will it be people or companies that are currently "fracking" in our hills and mountains in that area? Are we building this for the companies?	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. Senior water rights holders are not affected by implementation of action alternatives. The CALSIM II model assumptions provide the same deliveries to senior water rights holders under the No Action Alternative and all action alternatives. As discussed in Chapter 5, Water Supply, of the EIR/S, climate change, sea level rise, and population growth in the northern Delta watershed are anticipated to effect senior water rights holders (as shown in the comparison between the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative model runs) with or without implementation of the action alternatives.</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 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>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<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].) 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. An interim set of regulations allowing continued “well stimulation treatments” (including hydraulic fracturing) will remain in effect through 2014, and a new set of proposed regulations should take effect on January 2015. Senate Bill 4 also requires DOGGR, by July 1, 2015, to certify an EIR “in order to provide the public with detailed information regarding any potential environmental impacts of well stimulation in the state.” This EIR “shall address the issue of activities... that may occur at oil wells in the state existing prior to, and after” January 1, 2014. Through the rule-making process and the statutorily-mandated EIR, the state will better understand how much water is actually used for fracking in California and how much is likely to be used in the foreseeable future. Voluntary reporting indicates that the use of water for fracking is comparatively small, particularly compared with the water usage that has been reported in other states in connection with natural gas recovery. 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 (SWRCB) 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 SWRCB to revise water right permits in such a way as to restrict Delta water from being used for fracking. Please see Master Response 34 for additional information regarding use of water delivered by project facilities.</p>
1987	1	<p>I am a third-generation Californian and a property owner. I have read everything I can about our water issues and especially the twin tunnels. I am completely against the building of these tunnels! To think that this plan will solve our water problems, producing one more drop of water and not degrade the Delta, is utter nonsense. This "plan" is a water grab, a gift to Southern California big agriculture, who insanely, and greedily, insists on growing high water-using crops (like almonds) in an arid desert climate.</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan’s strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>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 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</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			permits and approvals for refuge water supplies or other environmental purposes.
1987	2	I couldn't be more disappointed in Jerry Brown. As a taxpayer, I want these tunnels stopped.	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.
1988	1	Stop the tunnels.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
1989	1	I oppose Governor Brown's plan for the tunnel -- as a boater and fisherman I have seen the Delta change dramatically as the water exports have increased. Any further water diversions will cause more harm to the fragile ecosystem as it is now. Unless heavy environmental protections are put in place, this plan is a total joke and waste of taxpayer money for the benefit of rich agricultural interests.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
1989	2	Taxpayer monies would be better spent on conservation measures [like] water storage and for the state to figure out correctly why the ecosystem is crashing. You cannot divert that much water without serious environmental issues, which we have now. It is time for the state to wake up and address environmental concerns first for this project instead of hiding the true issues. I firmly oppose this project.	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 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 additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.
1990	1	Please review and consider the attached documents and proposal to investigate and demonstrate an Emergency Fabric Pipeline Proposal for the Delta. This technology would be used to inexpensively move large volumes of fresh water from north of the Delta to Clifton Court as a result of an earthquake or major storm having caused a catastrophic levee collapse in the Delta. This plan would be less expensive and quicker to install than the current plan, which is to stock pile rocks at three levee island locations to be used to divert the Sacramento River. This would be an easy and economic proposal to test as is outlined in the attached document. I have attached an email in support of our Emergency Fabric Pipeline proposal from Professor Ray Seed, U.C. Berkeley, a worldwide levee expert, written to Joe Grindstaff, Executive Director of the Delta Stewardship Council. Also attached is a letter of support from Professor Bob Bea, U.C. Berkeley Professor, Director of the Center of Catastrophic Risk Management, Department of Engineering. Both these men were in charge of overseeing the Corps of Engineers levee repair efforts following the Katrina disaster (see attached document). I have attached a letter of support for our Delta Emergency Fabric Pipeline proposal from Jeff Kightlinger, General Manager of the Metropolitan Water District [MWD] of Southern California. A letter of support from Restore the Delta is also attached. A Resolution recently passed by the West Basin MWD Board of Directors in support of investigating our technology, along with a summary of their Staff's report to the West Basin Board, including a copy of a letter West Basin sent to California Director of Water Resources,	The commenter provides background about an Emergency Fabric Pipeline Proposal for the Delta. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Mark Cowin, requesting DWR's support for our technology are attached.</p> <p>A YouTube video of television news coverage of our waterbag transport technology which we successfully demonstrated during a 100-mile, three-day voyage in Washington State can be seen at:</p> <p>http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4TEJp6UZaDI.</p> <p>Photos and other information can be found on our website at:</p> <p>www.waterbag.com</p> <p>These websites will give you an understanding as to our team's experience in developing our proposed Emergency Fabric Pipeline technology for the Delta, and how it evolved so that it can be adapted to our Emergency Fabric Pipeline proposal for the Delta.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from someone as to how and when our technology will be reviewed. I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have. I can be reached at the above email address or by phone at: (562) 461-9195.</p> <p>I hope our team can be of help in solving one of the most serious problems facing California: the development of a secure and reliable water supply from the Delta.</p>	
1990	2	[ATT1: Letter supporting Spragg Pipeline Proposal Using Waterbag Technology in the Delta]	This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
1990	3	[ATT2: Delta Flexible Pipeline Demonstration Proposal by Terry G. Spragg & Associates -Submitted to Division of Engineering, California Department of Water Resources]	This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
1990	4	This proposal is submitted in response to concerns over a significant seismic event in Northern California that would destabilize multiple levees protecting islands in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta. These levees provide the channels that convey fresh water from its northern to southern portions and are shown in Figure 1. Clifton Court, where water is extracted for conveyance to Southern California, is noted.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
1990	5	[ATT2: ATT1: Figure 1. The Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta and its levees (from Fifth Staff Draft Delta Plan).]	This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
1990	6	Levee failures may result in the inundation of some Delta islands, causing saltwater intrusion into the Delta, displacing the freshwater that is normally in the channels that convey freshwater from its northern to southern portions. In this proposal we [Terry G. Spragg and Associates] do not address the likelihood or the magnitude of such catastrophic events; rather, we propose a rapidly deployable system for maintaining the flow of freshwater across a compromised area within the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the EIR/EIS.
1990	7	The system herein proposed offers effectiveness, flexibility, rapid implementation, and low cost as its primary advantages. In addition, the ability to pre-deploy system components in order to rapidly respond to levee failures regardless of where they occur and their magnitude is an important feature. The system we [Terry G. Spragg and Associates] propose	The comment does not raise any issues related to the EIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>is modular, portable, quickly deployed in a variety of configurations and represents a reliable solution for both short-term emergency situations and medium-term situations where cost is an important factor.</p>	
1990	8	<p>The Spragg Flexible Fabric Pipeline</p> <p>Terry G. Spragg [and] Associates has been developing systems for the cost-effective conveyance of fresh water for over two decades. Early efforts focused on the transport of water in large fabric barges that could be efficiently towed in end-to-end formations from regions of fresh water abundance to regions of drought. More recently, and in response to water needs over shorter distances, our attention has broadened to include the application where the fabric "container" is fixed and the water flows through it. The innovations associated with these technologies are protected through the US patent office and worldwide patent protection is in process.</p> <p>Conceptually, the flexible fabric pipeline is quite simple. It is a watertight tube of a specific circumference fabricated from coated fabric. Were this pipeline filled with fresh water and positioned within a body of water of the same fluid density, the pipeline's cross-section would be circular. This is seldom the case due to impurities or salinity in the surrounding water and instead it takes a shape as shown in Figure 2.</p> <p>The actual shape in terms of the width vs. the depth of the cross section is a function of the internal pressure and the circumference. Figure 2 portrays a situation where the cross sectional area is roughly 90% of a full circular cross section.</p> <p>The pressure represented by this shape is equal to the head height of the highest portion of the pipeline above the still waterline. Internally, the fluid pressure varies with depth and that determines the location of maximum fabric curvature, which is always at the waterline. The area of the cross section found below the water line compared to the total area is equal to the ratio of the internal and external water densities.</p> <p>Floating at the surface in low-current and low-wave environments is the most benign setting for this fabric pipeline. In such situations the system need only to be moored in place and offered protection against damage from vessel traffic. Such a configuration is shown in Figure 3 where reinforced webbing straps lead to anchor lines that keep the floating fabric pipeline in place along its route. The strength and the spacing of these mooring attachments depend on the setting in which the pipeline is to be deployed</p> <p>Because of the complex geography of the Delta and the unpredictable nature and location of catastrophic levee failures, other deployment arrangements may be needed. To that end, the Spragg Flexible Fabric Pipeline can be deployed completely submerged as well as on dry land. Fresh water, being less dense than brackish water or full-salinity seawater, tends to float on the surface even when contained in a fabric pipeline. The force needed to submerge that contained fresh water is easily calculable based on the density difference and the cross sectional area of the pipeline. For example a pipeline with a nominal diameter of 6 feet has a cross sectional area of 28.3 square feet. A 10-foot long section of this pipeline would have a volume of 283 cubic feet and a maximum submerged net buoyancy of approximately 500 pounds. It would therefore be relatively easy to submerge the fabric pipeline in areas where the conditions demand, such as for vessel navigation or to avoid undesirable environmental conditions at the surface. Given the emergency vessel traffic</p>	<p>The commenter provides background about an Emergency Fabric Pipeline Proposal for the Delta. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>associated with a major levee collapse, this is an essential feature.</p> <p>The submerged version of the proposed fabric pipeline has a different cross sectional shape compared to the floating version. Figure 4 shows such a cross section where the shaded portion is the conveyed water and the portion below is the anchoring means.</p> <p>This is more easily seen in Figure 5 where the mooring loads that keep the pipeline submerged are distributed into its length through the use of a pair of fabric skirts with lower edges in the form of a catenary. Much like catenary cables of a suspension bridge, this arrangement can keep the pipeline at a uniform depth and eliminate concerns that the pipeline might buoy up in between the anchor locations.</p> <p>The lower edges of the catenary skirts are reinforced with a tension member (steel cable or a high-modulus line). The size and spacing of the anchors depend on the size of the pipeline and the ability to pretension the catenary lines.</p> <p>In areas where submergence is called for and where the bottom is of suitably uniform depth, an alternate submerged configuration can be employed as is shown in Figure 6. In this case, two continuous ballast pockets are formed on the two lower sides of the pipeline. These pockets are filled with sand or gravel through purposely-designed openings during the deployment process. Air can escape from these pockets through perforations or the pockets themselves can be fabricated from porous fabric. The pockets and contained ballast are sufficient to firmly affix the pipeline directly on the bottom, minimizing its intrusion into the water column and risks of damage from surface traffic.</p> <p>The final configuration of the fabric pipeline is its deployment on land. In this case its cross section takes a shape resembling an ellipse, though as shown in Figure 7, it becomes flattened on the side upon which it rests.</p> <p>While this is the simplest configuration it is also one that imposes the greatest stress on the enclosing fabric due to the unsupported height of water within the pipeline cross section. As a result, the in-the-water configurations have the greater flow capacities for a given pipeline circumference and pressure ceiling.</p>	
1990	9	[ATT2: ATT2: Figure 2. A typical cross sectional shape of a floating fabric pipeline.]	This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
1990	10	[ATT2: ATT3: Figure 3. The mooring arrangement for a floating fabric pipeline.]	This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
1990	11	[ATT2: ATT4: Figure 4. The cross sectional shape of a submerged fabric pipeline.]	This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
1990	12	[ATT2: ATT5: Figure 5. The submerged fabric pipeline.]	This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
1990	13	[ATT2: ATT6: Figure 6. The bottom-deployed fabric pipeline.]	This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
1990	14	[ATT2: ATT7: Figure 7. The land-based fabric pipeline.]	This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
1990	15	<p>Flow Through a Fabric Pipeline</p> <p>Pressure loss in circular pipes is modeled by the Hazen-Williams Equation</p> $f = 0.2083 (100/c)^{1.852} \times q^{1.852} / dh^{4.8655}$ <p>where</p> <p>f = friction head loss in feet of water per 100 feet of pipe (ftH20/100 ft pipe)</p> <p>c = Hazen-Williams roughness constant (150 for coated fabric)</p> <p>q = volume flow (gal/min)</p> <p>dh = inside hydraulic diameter (inches)</p> <p>This formulation is applicable to the Spragg Flexible Fabric Pipeline since its cross sectional area is normally 90% or more of a circular pipe. The friction head loss from the formula determines the pressure that is required at the inlet of the pipeline to attain the desired flow rate. However, the pressure is limited by the hoop stress the pipeline material can sustain.</p> <p>The coated fabric used in the Spragg Flexible Fabric Pipeline has strength in both the warp and weft directions in excess of 1,000 pounds per inch [psi]. Our specifications for maximum pressure include a four-to-one safety factor.</p> <p>We propose a pipeline made of this fabric that has a circumference of 230 inches and an unstressed diameter of 73.2". A flow rate of 90,000 gallons per minute is equivalent to 145,000 acre-feet per year. Under these conditions there is a frictional head loss of 1.5" per 100 feet of fabric pipe, which translates into 13.2 feet of head loss for a two-mile length of pipeline or an internal pressure requirement of 5.67 psi. at the inlet of the pipe to maintain that flow. This generates in 207 pounds per inch of fabric stress, decreasing over the length of the pipeline to the next pumping station.</p> <p>The Spragg Flexible Fabric Pipeline can be made any length as long as the pressure requirements for maintaining flow stay within these above limits. In order to facilitate handling, the pipeline is provided in 250-foot-long modules. The 50 oz. per sq. yd. fabric for the basic pipe section results in a 1700-pound module.</p> <p>The modules can be joined by one of three methods. The first is a waterproof, high-strength zipper that allows rapid interconnections in the field. The second method is the use of a stiff internal mandrel with external rod clamps. This is a particularly useful approach when connecting a fabric section to a rigid portion of the pumping infrastructure, but can also be used for section joining as well. A third method is field ultrasonic welding of one section to</p>	The commenter provides background about an Emergency Fabric Pipeline Proposal for the Delta. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>another, an approach that requires specialized on-site equipment.</p> <p>The 145,000 acre-feet per year delivery capacity of one of these pipelines would provide 36% of the amount of water the Metropolitan Water District (MWD) is allowed to take from the river in a drought year. A parallel system of three of these fabric pipelines would exceed that needed capacity. Four fabric pipelines lying side by side would be able to annually deliver 580,000 acre-feet of good quality water from Hood to Clifton Court. The required length and path for such a deployment would depend on the portions of the Delta that become inundated with saltwater and must be bridged in order to provide water of acceptable quality. The location of Hood is noted in Figure 1 and simulations of levee failure by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California indicate it is beyond the intrusion range of levee damage resulting from a 6.5 magnitude earthquake.</p>	
1990	16	<p>A Proposed Technology Demonstration</p> <p>In order to properly evaluate the potential role of the Spragg Flexible Fabric Pipeline in confronting a Delta emergency, one need only demonstrate the performance of the portion of the pipeline between two pumping stations. Therefore Spragg Associates proposes the testing of a two-mile deployment of a 230-inch circumference system. This would involve the use of 42 sections of 250-foot length. These sections would comprise a suitable combination of module types depending on the preferred location of such a demonstration.</p> <p>The required head and flow rate for such a demonstration could be provided in a number of ways, possibly using pumping infrastructure already at the disposal of the Department of Water Resources. An example is diagrammed in Figure 8, showing what could be used to facilitate the experiment. The details of this head works need to be refined through discussions with DWR, as do the flow/pressure requirements and how best to meet them for the purposes of the test.</p> <p>In addition, a suitable path for the temporary installation of this demonstration system needs to be identified. The costs associated with installation will depend heavily on the details and logistic requirements of that location. We have made no assumptions on matters or responsibilities associated with permitting, site preparation, deployment, energy costs, or decommissioning.</p>	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1990	17	[ATT2: ATT8: Figure 8. An example of head works for the fabric pipeline.]	This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
1990	18	<p>The Cost Proposal</p> <p>The principal cost of the demonstration is for the pipeline modules and those costs will depend on the type of module needed for the combination of terrain and water along the route of the tests. We recommend that at least several modules of each type be included in the tests. The following cost proposal is based on a logical combination of modules, with the majority being surface-floating modules that would be positioned in a benign wave and current setting.</p> <p>Summary of costs for a two-mile demonstration pipeline:</p>	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>Quantity: Description: Unit cost: Cost</p> <p>1: 20' transition piece - head works to pipeline: \$5,280: \$5,280</p> <p>20: 250' x 230"-circumference floating pipeline module: \$37,950: \$759,000</p> <p>5: 250' x 230"-circumference submerged pipeline module: \$57,200: \$286,000</p> <p>5: 250' x 230"-circumference seabed pipeline module: \$45,100: \$225,500</p> <p>12: 250' x 230"-circumference land-based pipeline module: \$36,300: \$435,600</p> <p>43: Total cost estimate for two-mile fabric pipeline: \$1,711,380</p> <p>These prices include materials and fabrication and are FOB Seattle. They do not include any installation or costs associated with the means of pumping. These can be estimated once the demonstration location, allocation of test responsibilities, and issues of permitting have been resolved.</p>	
1990	19	<p>A Component of Delta Preparedness</p> <p>In the Fifth Staff Draft Delta Plan we read, "Despite the risks of levee failure, no published emergency action plan exists that addresses the consequences to federal and State water supply deliveries in the event of catastrophic levee failure in the Delta."</p> <p>The draft plan continues, "... failures are inevitable and will require the implementation of well-coordinated and carefully developed emergency-response planning efforts. ... The California Emergency Management Agency, DWR, and several local agencies are preparing individual emergency response plans for the Delta, but the development of these should be coordinated, tested, and practiced."</p> <p>The Spragg Flexible Fabric Pipeline could be a key component of that emerging response plan with modules centrally warehoused or pre-positioned based on an assessment of levee seismic vulnerability and saltwater intrusion models. An attractive approach to maximize responsiveness would be a barge-mounted system that deploys two miles of pipeline modules and includes the power, pumps, and head works needed for immediate operation.</p> <p>However, before such an approach can be implemented, tests are in order. The technology demonstration proposed above in an essential step towards preparedness. Terry G. Spragg & Associates looks forward to working with the DWR and other state agencies to take this first step.</p>	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1990	20	[ATT3: Letter supporting the Spragg Water Council, dated 10/04/2010]	This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
1990	21	[ATT4: October 16, 2007 Letter from University of California, Berkeley to Terry Spragg re: waterbag idea for water transport in the Delta]	This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
1990	22	[ATT5: May 20, 2008 Letter to Terry Spragg from Metropolitan District of Southern	This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		California on use of waterbag technology applications in the Delta]	already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
1990	23	[ATT6: Article titled "Fabric Pipeline deserves a test in the Delta" dated October 15, 2012, on waterbag technology developed by Terry Spragg for use in the Delta]	This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
1990	24	[ATT7: Resolution No. 7-13-1018 A Resolution of the Board of Directors of West Basin Municipal Water District Encouraging the Further Consideration of Waterbag Transport Technology]	This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
1990	25	[ATT8: Item on Action Calendar of the West Basin Municipal Water District on Waterbag Technology by Terry Spragg and Associates]	This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
1990	26	[ATT9: Letter and July 27, 2015 Resolution sent to Director Mark Cowin, California Department of Water Resources, from Rich Nagel, General Manager of the West Basin Municipal Water District to support consideration of waterbag technology for transporting water in California]	This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
1991	1	The problem is that California is a semi-arid state with insufficient clean water for all needs. Rebalancing the shortages does not solve that problem. We need more fresh water. \$100 billion dollars (the likely real cost of the twin tunnels project) would buy a lot of desalinization and reprocessing of sewer water into potable water where needed. It would also buy a lot more storage of rain, but only if we get the rain. Governor Brown would truly leave a fine legacy if he would lead the state into having much more fresh water. For the same money.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
1992	1	The planned export of Northern California fresh water is a massive misuse of existing public Northern California water assets.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. DWR and Reclamation operate with water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board that are junior in priority to many senior water rights holders in the Delta watershed. Under the action alternatives, senior water rights holders would continue to receive the same amount of water as under the No Action Alternative. Conveyance facilities under the action alternatives could only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and in accordance with the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards.
1992	2	This planned loss of fresh water will cause salinity intrusion damage to existing farming.	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.
1992	3	The economic cost of the loss of Northern California water will ultimately exceed the cost of desalination.	Please refer to Master Response 7 regarding desalination. Please see Master Response 5 regarding costs of the project and Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need.
1992	4	This plan has not been approved by the California voters or the EPA.	The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.
1993	1	<p>I'm sure you have heard all of the reasons for not building these tunnels that will devastate the Delta. This letter is to add our names to those that so vehemently oppose this project.</p> <p>With so many roads needing repairs, schools needing help, etc., I don't understand why building tunnels to destroy the countryside, farming, homes, jobs and life as many know it is so very important when it does not manufacture one drop of additional water. It just takes from one end of the state and deposits into another!</p>	<p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p> <p>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 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>
1993	2	<p>What will happen when we need water -- is the south going to send it back? We are already in a drought and water rationing. How can Governor Brown justify sending what little we have away?</p>	<p>Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>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 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 additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
1994	1	<p>I am a concerned citizen who is strongly opposed to the construction of the "Delta Tunnels."</p> <p>How does the construction of these tunnels conserve water?</p> <p>What is being done to replace the water which will be forever lost and diverted?</p> <p>How will the loss to agriculture be determined and reimbursed?</p> <p>Do we really know what destruction to the Delta and Delta habitats will be done?</p> <p>This is political folly!</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.</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. For more information regarding agricultural mitigation please see Master Response 18.</p>
1995	1	<p>We must protect our water. It's a precious commodity. The impact that this tunnel could have is harmful in too many ways. Environmental, people's health and the economic repercussions. Please don't allow the Delta Tunnel to go forward.</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>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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.</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 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 additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
1996	1	Please do not forsake the wildlife. Healthy ecosystems are a priority for me and I hope you will act to protect them.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>
1997	1	Too much money for a project that will not accomplish goals. In fact, the damage it would cause to the Delta, disrupting many natural processes, is illegal under the Clean Water Act.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of 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>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S. Please refer to Master Response 5.</p>
1998	1	<p>For four years extremely toxic lithium salts, aluminum, barium, strontium, and the extremely toxic ethylene dibromide (EDB), known desiccants, have been heavily sprayed over thousands of square miles of the eastern Pacific.</p> <p>Several EDB "dry" fogs have come into Southern California overnight. They kill freshly formed flowers (such as lilacs and hydrangeas) and drain the plant's chlorophyll.</p> <p>It's not about combatting global warming, it's a Zionist Rothschild Khazarian Mafia (RKM) evil malevolent attack on humanity.</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>This comment does not pertain to the EIR/EIS content or the environmental review process.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
1999	1	The purpose of this letter is to state my strong opposition to the Delta tunnels plan. I am a fifth generation Californian, and over the years have become very concerned about preserving our natural resources. The Delta tunnels would further destroy the fish and bird habitats of the Delta. Low water, warmer water, and saltwater intrusion have already damaged these and other species of the Delta.	The commenter does not offer any evidence on how the project would result in aquatic and terrestrial impacts related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
1999	2	The tunnels plan would violate Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.	<p>The project has been developed with the goals of minimizing and avoiding incidental take of listed species to the maximum extent practicable. Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 12, Terrestrial Biological Resources, of the DEIR/DEIS and sections 2 through 5 of the RDEIR/SDEIS describe effects of the proposed project and several alternatives on fish and wildlife species in the Plan Area.</p> <p>For preferred alternative 4A, ESA compliance for construction and operation of water intakes in the north Delta and associated conveyance facilities would be achieved solely through Section 7. Reclamation would be the lead federal action agency for Section 7 compliance. Reclamation's Section 7 compliance would be expected to also address the Section 7 compliance needs for the USACE permit actions. In cooperation with DWR, Reclamation would prepare a biological assessment (BA) for submission to USFWS and NMFS requesting formal consultation under ESA Section 7. It is expected that USFWS and NMFS would ultimately prepare a Biological Opinion authorizing incidental take of federally listed species.</p> <p>For more information please see 1.1.5.2 of Section 1 Introduction of the RDEIR/SDEIS and Master Response 5 (Compliance with ESA).</p>
1999	3	In addition, saltwater intrusion will damage existing farms in the Delta.	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.
1999	4	Diverting Delta water for purposes of irrigating farms in the Southern San Joaquin Valley is a bad plan. This land should never have been planted in crops and orchards for which there was not sufficient groundwater, and should be used for more sustainable uses. As you are aware, almonds are a water-thirsty crop and should not have been planted in that region.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>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 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>
1999	5	Reclamation and DWR should prepare a new Draft EIR/EIS that will include alternatives that reduce water exports and increase Delta flows for consideration by the public and decision-makers. Such alternatives should comply with the Delta Reform Act and the federal Endangered Species and Clean Water Acts.	The documentation generated by this proposed project has undergone extensive public and scientific input, discussion, and transparency, including the posting of administrative draft chapters online and providing many more opportunities for public participation than is normally required by the CEQA/NEPA processes (see Master Response 41 [Transparency]). Please also refer to Master Response 4 (Alternative Development),

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>and 10 (Compliance with Delta Reform Act).</p> <p>The Final EIR/EIS is intended to provide sufficient CEQA and NEPA support for approval of the proposed project or any of the action alternatives for either compliance strategy. In turn, applicable permits and approvals from public agencies other than the Lead Agencies will be sought while relying on the Final EIR/EIS. These other public agencies are referred to as responsible agencies and trustee agencies under CEQA (State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15381 and 15386) and cooperating agencies under NEPA (e.g., USACE and EPA). These agencies will make their own findings on the merit of the project and approved mitigation, while conditioning their approvals, as required.</p>