

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
200	1	It is my understanding that more water is allocated from California Water Projects than exist by a factor of 3 or more. How will the water fix increase water deliveries to Southern San Joaquin farmers without taking it away from Delta farmers, salmon habitats to prevent salt water intrusion and degrading the Delta environments? [sic]	<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 project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities, including operations to protect water quality, can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see <a href="http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml">http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml</a>) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see <a href="http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html">http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html</a>).</p> <p>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.</p>
201	1	Water is our most precious resource--it is finite...building tunnels to transport more water south will not increase the available water. Rather than building tunnels we must increase recycling, use of brown water, and desal & consenation [sic] as options for better protecting everyone's right to water.	<p>The project is 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). In addition, Master Response 4 provides an overview of the alternatives development process that resulted in the alternatives carried forward for detailed evaluation in the EIR/EIS. For additional information regarding desalination, please see Master Response 7.</p>
201	2	I am concerned that this tunnel plan will increase the water moved south to the demise of the Delta, the habitat, and animals, birds, & fish that live there [sic]. We have already seen the effects of increased salinity in the west Delta including habitat change/destruction, decreased crop yields, and unfit water for consumption. Moving more water south will certainly increase the destruction of the Delta.	<p>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 facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities, including operations to protect water quality, can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see <a href="http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml">http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml</a>) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see <a href="http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html">http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html</a>).</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
202	1	<p>How can the government implement this ill-conceived attack on the health of the California Delta without voter approval?</p> <p>The massive misinformation presented in the BDCP/water fix is an insult.</p> <p>No new water is provided. No hedge against future, and continues drought.</p> <p>No storage, no recharging of the aquifer.</p> <p>A boomdoggie [sic] of the first magnitude.</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. 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 with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. 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>For information regarding why water storage was not included in the proposed project, refer to Master Response 37 (Water Storage) and Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS. Also refer to: Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), and Master Response 6 (Demand Management).</p>
203	1	<p>I am against the tunnel project. There is a better solution. The Delta needs restored water flows and levee upgrades. Not destructive tunnels and water grabs. We need to strengthen the existing Delta levees. We need to follow the advice of state experts and reduce the amount of water taken from the Delta. We need to retire toxic farmland. We should increase natural flows of fresh water through the Delta. I live in the city that is the gateway to the Delta. A region rich in wildlife and recreation activities. We must protect this valuable resource.</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. Additionally, providing regulatory oversight to agribusinesses is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis.</p> <p>While flood management is not a project purpose, it recognized that levee maintenance and safety in the Delta is an important issue for the residents of the Delta and for statewide interests. Please see Appendix 6A (BDCP/California WaterFix Coordination with Flood Management Requirements for additional information on this issue within the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives), Master Response 31 (Delta Reform Act), and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) for additional information.</p>
204	1	<p>We love the tunnels!</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.</p>
205	1	<p>After viewing the RDEIR/SDEIS information, it is clear that this is another "green wash" coverup of the theft of water deeded to maintain California fisheries and the all-important flushing of the Delta and Bay, the way nature designed our environment. REDIR/SDEIS are</p>	<p>As a plan prepared to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity,</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		the mechanisms used to cloud the reality that the water taken from the Delta will kill fish, turn the Delta and the Bay into a salt water estuary, and usher in an environmental disaster for northern California, for the profits of corporate agriculture.	the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
206	1	The Delta is the beating heart of our state. It entertains us, it feeds us, and more than that, the health of the Delta reflects the health of our state. To divert water, the life blood of California, away from this beating heart will have consequences for the Delta and the state on wildlife, agriculture, and residents. This is the sort of project which will have unforeseen impacts for generations to come, and which, once done, can never be undone. The heart of our state deserves more respect.	The project proposes to secure California water supplies and improve the Delta ecosystem by implementing a 9,000 cfs water diversion point in the north Delta, where its operations will provide for improved flows. Constructing new water diversion points in the north Delta with state-of-the-art fish screens and providing a means to transport water supplies under the Delta, rather than through sensitive natural channels, would help maintain reliable water deliveries for two-thirds of California's population while balancing the needs of the Delta ecosystem.
207	1	Simple: stop the tunnels and super train with feasibility study funds on EA. Use that money as down payments on a few desalination plants. Use lotto money to pay for all the plants. Also start anew lotto IE: CAH2OLOTTTO for more desalination plants. Tell Jerry Brown to shut up and go home. Put Trump in Charge.	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.
208	1	It will take 14 years to construct the tunnels. How will that help with the drought?	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Over the long-term, 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. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries in drier periods.</p> <p>The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow <a href="http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf">http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf</a>. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well.</p> <p>The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: <a href="http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/">http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/</a>.</p> <p>Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p>
208	2	<p>30,000 acres of habitat will be destroyed due to the construction of the tunnels. The original/previous document dealt with the mitigation of this loss, but it is missing in the current document. Where is the language in this document explaining how, when, and where habitat damage will be restored? Your fast facts page says that "habitat restoration measures (are) being planned and funded in the near future."</p> <p>How will the decision makers (CEQA) make good decisions regarding this project, absent the details?</p>	<p>Because the location and details of the Environmental Commitments are not yet known and because of this distinction for the proposed Environmental Commitments as defacto mitigation measures, the level of analyses included in the EIR/EIS is commensurate with the analyses that are required under CEQA for the effects of mitigation measures, which in most cases, under common practice, is conducted at less level of detail than features or facility described for a proposed project.</p> <p>As for many mitigation measures that involve physical changes to the environment, they're implementation may require more site specific environmental review to address specific effects of these actions. The EIR/EIS provides sufficient information regarding the potential environmental effects of proposed Environmental</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Commitments to reach significance conclusions as required under CEQA. This information will be used by the lead agencies during the project decision-making process.</p>
209	1	<p>It will take 14 years to construct these tunnels. How will that help with the drought?</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Over the long-term, 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. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries in drier periods.</p> <p>The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow <a href="http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf">http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf</a>. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well.</p> <p>The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: <a href="http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/">http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/</a>.</p> <p>Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.</p>
209	2	<p>Isn't the majority of the habitat designated under California EcoRestore for mitigation for the 2008 biological opinions? And isn't that habitat for damage already done to the Delta?</p>	<p>The commenter is asking a question about California EcoRestore and its relationship to the 2008 Biological Opinions. EcoRestore does include implementation of the required mitigation for the State Water Project and Central Valley Project. California EcoRestore is unassociated with any of the proposed habitat restoration under Alternatives 2D, 4A, and 5A in the EIR/EIS but does include much of the BDCP conservation strategy presented in the HCP/NCCP alternatives.</p>
210	1	<p>This project will cost about \$40 billion. St. Resnick's land on the west side of the valley could be bought for about \$2 billion. His water is about what is used in Los Angeles. Give his water to Los Angeles, save about \$38 billion, and let the west valley go back to desert.</p>	<p>For more information regarding agricultural beneficial water use please see Master Response 34. 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>
211	1	<p>The drought in California is already bad enough. Our club is located in Folsom CA, so we fish Folsom Lake a lot but it is now becoming unfishable due to low water levels. This is pushing us towards the delta to do our fishing. We have already noticed a negative effect just from the wall put into the delta. The tunnels will ruin the water flow and the fishery which was once the best in the nation. Stop the tunnels and save the Delta!</p>	<p>The proposed project would not decimate fishing opportunities. With implementation of mitigation measures, Impact REC-4: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of constructing the proposed water conveyance facilities" would be less than significant. Impact REC-5: "Result in long-term reduction of recreational fishing opportunities as a result of the operation of the proposed water conveyance facilities" would also be less than significant with no mitigation required. Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need.</p>
212	1	<p>I am implacably opposed to the tunnels project, but I want to thank you for the opportunity to meet and talk with DWR professionals about the design and engineering of the</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
		Alternative 4/4A project, and for the opportunity to talk with the Army Corps of Engineers representatives about their jurisdiction and role with the project.	
213	1	<p>Re: Rec-3:</p> <p>On the map I see a potential 5 mph zone due to the barge unloading facility on Old River next to Twin Sloughs. This is the most popular waterski/wakeboard zone next to Discovery Bay. Please do not put a 5 mph zone there, it will ruin the sport as you obviously can't ski or wakeboard next to a 5 mph zone (speedy for these sports exceed 15 mph). It would also force you to stop and drop your skier near a dangerous curve to continue skiing on Old River, another extremely popular waterski area that loads to Victoria Slough. Over the years, we see more and more 5 mph zones popping up which not only ruins watersports, but creates safety hazards by those who refuse to adhere to speed limits. With all the lakes drying up in CA, this area has become very populated, and messing it up will have downward consequences for many people.</p>	A temporary barge unloading facility would disrupt boat passage and navigation at and near its location on Old River for up to 5 years. Although implementing Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a and helping to fund measures to reduce aquatic weeds would reduce impacts on recreational navigation, these effects would remain adverse because of the long duration of construction which would continually reduce recreation opportunities and distract from experiences occurring near construction activity. Please refer to Impact REC-3 under Alternatives 4 and 4A for more information.
214	1	[ATT1: <a href="http://tinyurl.com/nt6nzay">http://tinyurl.com/nt6nzay</a> -- Graph of water surface storage in California.]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in the comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
214	2	[ATT2: <a href="http://tinyurl.com/c7on6p">http://tinyurl.com/c7on6p</a> -- Alternate tunnel routes map.]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in the comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
214	3	[ATT3: Benicia Salinity Control Gates map.]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in the comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
214	4	[ATT4: <a href="http://tinyurl.com/l3npwmg">http://tinyurl.com/l3npwmg</a> -- Figure: Delta Exports Vary from Year to Year.]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in the comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
214	5	[ATT5: <a href="http://tinyurl.com/ktkv6hj">http://tinyurl.com/ktkv6hj</a> -- Delta map with Benicia Salinity Control Gates and proposed pump stations.]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in the comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
214	6	<p>Benicia Salinity Control Gates are pictured above in blue , between 11of the 12 supports on the newer Benicia bridge and will, per DWR, allow for 10 to 46 million acre feet (maf) of environmentally beneficial fresh water to be exported south, which would end our water shortage today! It will cost millions (instead of 15 billion), add more water than the twin tunnels, and can be completed in months (instead of 14 years). The gates would keep the fresh Delta water separated from the salty Bay water, and stop salt water incursion by limiting the flow of fresh water out of the area. The one always open support [pictured above in green] does not have a salinity gate, so that fish and boat traffic can freely travel in and out of each zone. It is like naturally narrowing the water way.</p> <p>Not a dam, barrier or locks stopping all flow of water, which DWR studied in 1931and failed on the environmental study due to fish migration issues and not clearing out sediment and effluence from the Delta.</p> <p>Per DWR study in 1931, 1.3 maf is needed to naturally keep the salt water out of the Delta and in the Bay, which I have rounded up to 2 maf in my calculations above. Per DWR reports</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. . The alternatives included in the EIR/EIS represent a legally adequate reasonable range of alternatives and the scope of the analysis of alternatives fully complies with both CEQA and NEPA. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>in dry years like 2014, 12 maf are available for export south, and to mix into the Bay's salty water. In wet years, there is up to 48 maf available for export, and to go out the Bay. Some salt water entering the Suisun Bay and Marsh is fine, but the goal is to keep the salty water west of Sherman Island, where the aqueduct intakes should be relocated. The gates are a much better option than simply releasing more water from the reservoirs in the north to keep the salinity back and help the aquatic life. This would keep the Delta at a closer-to-high-tide water level constantly with slower moving flows, which will help the levees last longer. Most important benefits would be that more water can flow from the north Sacramento River naturally through the Delta to the pumps in Tracy, for more usable water availability once the gates are in place.</p> <p>Positive environmental benefit -- No adverse environmental problems, because the water way is never blocked, only constricted. More fresh water in the Delta means colder water due to greater depth because the waters are kept closer-to-high-tide levels in the Delta. Better crops in the Delta with less salt water to deal with. Increased reserves in reservoirs, because less water needed to be released to hold back salty Bay water for fish and pumps. More reservoir water means more colder water for release when needed for fish upstream. Support the co-equal goals of people and the Delta [<a href="http://tinyurl.com/kno3uqg">http://tinyurl.com/kno3uqg</a>]. Added sales of water would be allowed without harming the Delta environment, which would allow for more farming in the central and southern California areas. More farming is more jobs, and more food for people and wildlife. Freshwater marshes are one of the most productive ecosystems on earth.</p> <p>Tracy aqueduct pumps intake: The intakes need to be moved, or added to, in order to not reverse the flows of the Delta. Why? Per the DWR Delta Exports chart on the other side, the San Joaquin River has 1.7 to 8.4 maf of flow, which is what the Tracy pumps pull from. So, to max out the aqueducts at 10 maf, a better source for the intake is needed, which the closest (keeping in mind the co-equal goals) is Sherman Island, just outside the sensitive Delta ecosystem area.</p> <p>Per a study done by Dr. Pyke's Western Delta Intake Concept (WDIC) (<a href="http://www.FixCAWater.com">www.FixCAWater.com</a>), the intake pumps should be moved to Sherman Island to naturally control over-pumping of the fresh water. This allows the extra water, that would normally just mix with the Bay, to be exported south with no adverse environmental impacts.</p> <p>Running the pipeline(s) near the rail line and freeway would allow for a nearly straight route from the Tracy pumps to Sherman Island, which is significantly less expensive because it is only 20 miles, instead of 37 miles.</p> <p>\$3 million to put in a temporary partial dam [by AquaDam] to limit water in about 1 month's time for 2015, while the more permanent gates can be designed and installed at the foot of the new Benicia Bridge.</p>	
215	1	<p>The rivers and streams of Northern California have public trust value. The public trust is an affirmation of duty of the State of California to protect the heritage of the streams, lakes and tidelands of California. The Twin Tunnel Project does not fairly balance the water rights of Northern California, stretching from the Bay Delta to the Oregon border, against those of the Central Valley and Los Angeles.</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 proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. It is understood that water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation are not fully available in many years to deliver total contract amounts to SWP and CVP water users due to available water supplies and demands of senior water rights holders and regulatory requirements. The State Water Resources Control Board is responsible for issuing the water rights and confirming that the use of the water rights are consistent with water rights law and the California Constitution. Operations for the proposed project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641).</p> <p>For more information regarding area of origin and public trust doctrine please see Master Responses 26 and 13, respectively.</p>
216	1	<p>A resounding no to Twin Tunnels, Delta Tunnels, California Water Fix or whatever name it will be given to mislead the public because the Fix does not fix, but will have the following devastating impact on our 5-county Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta region:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lasting environmental damage to the Delta eco system literally destroying the Delta.</li> <li>2. Lasting sever economic downturn to a multi-billion dollar farming and tourism industry.</li> <li>3. Taking away a treasured way of life for farmers, families and businesses.</li> <li>4. Spending billions of dollars without creating any new needed water.</li> </ol> <p>5. Simply using the antiquated fix to move water from the north to the south is not the answer to California's water problems!</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 with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
216	2	<p>Here is what California needs:</p> <p>Californians pride themselves for being on the edge of technology - let's use it with a comprehensive water plan with bold, innovative solutions using new technologies which will produce more water and manage the State's water supply, such as desalination, capturing, recycling, creating new water efficiencies in industry, commercial and residential applications, etc.</p> <p>We need to save our Delta and let our Delta area farmers continue to contribute to California's largest economy: farming</p>	<p>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. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).</p> <p>The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species — all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow <a href="http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf">http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf</a>. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well.</p> <p>The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: <a href="http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/">http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/</a>.</p> <p>Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1, EIR/EIS, describes the range of conveyance alternatives considered in the development of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California’s water resources.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage.</p>
217	1	<p>The twin tunnels are projected to be completed in 2030. So this Water Fix won’t be accomplished for another 15 years. And what major public works project was ever completed on time and on budget?</p> <p>To date, a complete cost-benefit analysis of the project has not been published by the State. Stakeholders don’t know if it is a workable, sustainable project that they will be able to afford in 15 years when it is completed. But yet they must sign onto it now, so that it can move forward. Is that a sensible business decision?</p> <p>If the twin tunnels does go forward and stakeholders find they cannot afford it, will the California tax payers be required to bankroll the billions of dollars in construction costs and subsidize the price of the water that the stakeholder receive from the Delta?</p>	<p>DWR acknowledges your opposition to the project. Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on the costs of project implementation.</p>
217	2	<p>In 2014 a UC Davis study concluded that the Sacramento and San Joaquin River System is over allocated by five times the amount of water that flows through it in an average year. There is not sufficient water to meet the contracted needs that the State Water Resources Control Board has approved. And the new tunnel plan will be incapable of taking even more.</p>	<p>Water rights issued on rivers in the Trinity and Central Valley watersheds include a wide range of beneficial uses from hydropower to municipal, industrial, and agricultural water users. However, not all of the water diverted under the water rights is consumptively used. For example, water diverted for hydropower electric generation is fully returned to the water bodies; and a portion of the water diverted from municipal, industrial, and agricultural water uses is returned to the water bodies. In addition, the amount of water diverted is dependent upon water rights priorities and the need to meet environmental flow and quality requirements. Therefore, it is difficult to compare the total volume of water rights licenses to the total amount of water available in the system. For example, water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation are not fully available to provide water under the SWP and CVP water contracts in many years due to the demands of senior water rights holders and regulatory requirements.</p> <p>The action alternatives would only export water allocated to the SWP and CVP under existing water rights, as limited by hydrologic conditions and regulatory requirements issued by the State and federal agencies.</p>
217	3	<p>The Governor has admitted that the tunnels do not produce any new water, therefore; a year like 2015 would require that the tunnels remain empty. This is not what I call a cost effective budget.</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. Deliveries to in-Delta senior water rights users are the same under the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and all action alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS in accordance with 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.</p> <p>The total amount of water exported by month in each water year type for each action alternative is presented in Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Model Results, of the EIR/EIS. As shown in Appendix 5A, Section C, the north Delta intake tunnels would not be fully utilized except for a few months in wet years. However, it is important to have 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 north Delta intakes would have minimal flows that would be required for maintenance of the pumps during critical dry years.</p>
217	4	<p>There are less expensive alternatives that can be completed much sooner than 2030. And</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. The issue of farming in the San Luis Unit is beyond the scope of the project as the Lead Agencies do not have</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>some of these alternatives will actually create new water and even save lives.</p> <p>First of all, stop farming 300,000 acres of distressed, selenium-laced land served by San Luis Unit (which is in the Westlands Water District). That would save 455,000 acre-feet of water annually. (and the San Joaquin River will be less polluted from runoff).</p>	<p>local land use/zoning authority. Please refer to Master Response 6 for details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 34 for details on the determination of beneficial use and Master Response 4 for details on the selection of alternatives.</p>
217	5	<p>There are less expensive alternatives that can be completed much sooner than 2030. And some of these alternatives will actually create new water and even save lives.</p> <p>The Twin Tunnels do nothing to save lives and property in the Delta in case of an earthquake. Levee upgrades can be completed in half the time it will take to build tunnels and for about 80% less then [sic] what the tunnels will cost. Loss of life will be abated and when export water "is available" it will have strong, reliable existing Delta waterways to reach the Tracy pumps for export.</p>	<p>Please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP.</p> <p>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 affected by the BDCP/CWF. Levees are an important public safety resource and the proposed project would not change levee policy or replace ongoing programs and grant projects aimed at facilitating and supporting levee improvements in or outside the Delta. It recognized that levee maintenance and safety in the Delta is an important issue for the residents of the Delta and for statewide interests.</p>
217	6	<p>There are less expensive alternatives that can be completed much sooner than 2030. And some of these alternatives will actually create new water and even save lives.</p> <p>The Western Delta Intakes Concept should be seriously evaluated by DWR and SWCB. This is a Twin Tunnel alternative.</p>	<p>Although many of the proposed alternatives included meritorious water policy principles, the proposals rejected by the Lead Agencies did not qualify as appropriate alternatives for various reasons. For example, proposals were rejected because they were inconsistent with the project's objectives and purpose and need or included components that are beyond the scope of the project. The text of the Draft EIR/EIS in Chapter 3 (section 3.2) and Appendix 3A to that document thoroughly explain the process used to develop the alternatives, and explain why certain potential alternatives were considered but ultimately rejected by the Lead Agencies</p> <p>Please refer to Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1 and Master Response 4 (Alternative Development).</p>
217	7	<p>There are less expensive alternatives that can be completed much sooner than 2030. And some of these alternatives will actually create new water and even save lives.</p> <p>Increase the reliance on local water by improving storage and capture. Repair leaky municipal pipes. In Sacramento alone at least 1 in every 10 gallons of water "goes missing" as it flows through damaged and broken city pipes. And this is a common occurrence through California cities.</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response 37 for information on why new storage was not included in the proposed project. 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 6 for additional details on demand management.</p>
218	1	<p>I'm a wine grape grower from Clarksburg in the North Delta.</p> <p>According to environmental impact report, the tunnels will create saltwater intrusion that will double salinity in the Delta. This is our irrigation water. If you farm with salt water, it ruins the land.</p> <p>There are half a million acres of prime farmland in the Delta. This saltwater intrusion will wreck prime farmland in order to send Sacramento River water south. Much of this water will go to Westlands Water District, where the soils and drainage are already impaired and will eventually have to be retired anyway. This makes no sense.</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>Please refer to Master Response 14, Water Quality, for more details regarding effects of the alternatives on salinity levels.</p>
218	2	<p>The environmental impact report says that to mitigate for the salty water, Delta farmers will need to switch to salt-tolerant crops. These are lower value crops than we farm now. This</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,</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		will hit the economy of the Delta hard.	<p>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>Please refer to Master Response 14, Water Quality, for more details regarding effects of the alternatives on salinity levels.</p>
218	3	<p>By creating saltwater intrusion and ruining prime farmland, the tunnels will effectively create a wealth transfer from the Delta to farmers and developers in the south.</p> <p>This is not only bad public policy, it's also wrong.</p>	<p>As described under Impact AG-2 in Chapter 14, Agriculture, water quality modeling results indicate that it is unlikely that there would be increased frequency of exceedance of agricultural electrical conductivity (salinity) objectives in the western, interior, or southern Delta. However, there could be increased long-term and drought period average EC levels during the summer months in the Sacramento River at Emmaton under Alternative 4A relative to the No Action Alternative (ELT), which could adversely affect agricultural beneficial uses. Implementation of Mitigation Measures AG-1, GW-1, GW-5, and WQ-11 (including Mitigation Measure WQ-11ea) will reduce the severity of these adverse effects.</p> <p>Please also refer to Master Response 26 regarding exports.</p>
218	4	<p>Please restore our faith in our government.</p> <p>Do the right thing and shut down this tunnel plan. There are better solutions to California's water woes</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 with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
219	1	<p>Delta farmers are very understanding and compassionate regarding our fellow California farmers' need for irrigation water. What we are adamantly opposed to is the diversion and destruction of the Sacramento River Delta, the largest fresh water delta in the Western Hemisphere. The four year drought California is experiencing has exposed many short comings in the State's water policy and operations. The State Department of Water Resources has proved itself incapable of managing water policy by contracting multiple times the average available water supply to State entities and water agencies. Now they want to build 15,000 cubic feet per second tunnels around the Delta, a plan that creates not one ounce of new available water, does nothing to bolster our on or off stream storage of available water during the annual wet season, and only promulgates the continued destruction of the diverse environment of aquatic, terrestrial, and water fowl species that have relied on the Delta estuary system for food and shelter for millennia.</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation on rivers in the Trinity and Central Valley watersheds include a wide range of beneficial uses from hydropower to municipal, industrial, and agricultural water users. However, not all of the water diverted under the water rights is consumptively used. For example, water diverted for hydropower electric generation is fully returned to the water bodies; and a portion of the water diverted from municipal, industrial, and agricultural water uses is returned to the water bodies. In addition, the amount of water diverted is dependent upon water rights priorities and the need to meet environmental flow and quality requirements. Therefore, it is difficult to compare the total volume of water rights licenses to the total amount of water available in the system. For example, water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation are not fully available to provide water under the SWP and CVP water contracts in many years due to the demands of senior water rights holders and regulatory requirements.</p> <p>The action alternatives would only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards. The alternatives do not change diversion of senior water rights and continue to meet instream flow requirements. Under the range of alternatives considered in the EIR/S full contract amounts are not delivered in the majority of times to the SWP and CVP water contractors. Full contract deliveries</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>occur in extremely wet years.</p> <p>The project water delivery system would be operated in a manner to protect water users and environmental habitat located upstream of and in the Delta in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities can be found in DWR’s State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see <a href="http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml">http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml</a>) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see <a href="http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html">http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html</a>).</p>
219	2	<p>During the past decade of the vetting process for the BDCP, many other options and ideas have been brought forth to assist in moving precious water to areas of critical need which would ease the horrendous impacts on the Delta that the tunnels exacerbate. All such plans have been summarily dismissed without consideration as the political machine moved to create science to enforce their preconceived conveyance and used fear of imminent levee collapse to bolster their arguments and build public support for their preferred outcome. Given past performance, we can in no way trust them to do what is right for the Delta in the face of political and economic pressure.</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 with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please 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.</p>
219	3	<p>Delta residents and farmers whole-heartedly support the conveyance of water excess to local and environmental needs through the existing network of Delta channels and levees which must be maintained to assure a viable Delta. We also support the building of additional on and off stream water storage facilities to increase the amount of water available to other state and municipal water agencies. We support conservation efforts and utilization of recycled water for crops and landscape. We support desalinization efforts along the California coast to supply some of the needs of cities and urban requirements. We support options that supply new water at a cost that will be affordable and economically sustainable for our fellow farmers in the Central Valley that do not concurrently destroy the Delta estuary.</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. Additionally, providing regulatory oversight to agribusinesses is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis.</p> <p>While flood management is not a project purpose, it recognized that levee maintenance and safety in the Delta is an important issue for the residents of the Delta and for statewide interests. Please see Appendix 6A (BDCP/California WaterFix Coordination with Flood Management Requirements) for additional information on this issue within the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Although desalination is already a part of California’s overall water portfolio and will surely become a bigger part with the passage of time, the technology will not be capable within any kind of foreseeable timeframe to produce amounts of usable water comparable to those associated with the alternatives included in the BDCP/California WaterFix EIR/EIS (See Master Response 7 [Desalination]).</p> <p>Additional water storage was eliminated from consideration in the BDCP EIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS through the alternatives development and screening process (discussed below and in Appendix 3A, Identification of</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>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 see Master Response 37 (Water Storage) for additional information regarding on and off stream water storage.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives), Master Response 31 (Delta Reform Act), and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) for additional information.</p>
219	4	<p>As we have done over the past decade, we again today call on Governor Brown and the Department of Water Resources to put politics aside and consider better ideas and plans for the future of this great State. Other options will provide water fairly for the state's citizens without destroying the largest fresh water estuary in the Western Hemisphere. Thank you for hearing our concerns today.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7 regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage.</p>
220	1	<p>In light of all of the controversy over the Delta Tunnels, I am voicing my opposition to its undertaking. Estimates have shown that the stated \$25 billion is a considerable shortfall of the actual cost of building these tunnels. Most of the reports I have read state that these tunnels would cost in excess of \$50 billion, with no stated cap on the spending. As a consumer and taxpayer, I shudder to think how high my property taxes and water rates could go up to pay for this adventure. I ask you to consider killing this project and exploring other ways to get water down south.</p>	<p>DWR acknowledges your opposition to the project. The proposed project would cost approximately \$15 billion to build. There would be additional costs for mitigation of approximately \$800 million. Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on the costs of project implementation and the controls that will be established to reduce the risk of cover overruns.</p>
221	1	<p>Our water delivery system for California is broken. The state has dutifully moved forward with addressing our antiquated system that is not as environmentally friendly and is subject to failure in a catastrophe. We need to move forward and advance our efforts to redo that system. New conveyance facilities are needed that can be managed in a way [to] both deliver water and also protect the environment. Additionally, we need to look at our other systems that allow us better flood control and water storage for our growing population.</p> <p>For these reasons, I support the proposal to fix our water system.</p>	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p>
223	1	<p>The recently released and rebranded Bay-Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP)/California "WaterFix" and the partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report and Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (RDEIR/SDEIS) contain substantial changes from the initial public draft. We hope that this latest iteration of the BDCP will provide a complete and detailed description of the revised project, an accurate assessment and characterization of the potential impacts, and the specific elements of a comprehensive mitigation strategy to compensate for the impacts of this massive project as an extensive and detailed analysis is required in order to make that determination.</p> <p>The spirit of both the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is grounded in fully disclosing the impacts of project actions so that we, as a society, can make decisions with respect to our communities,</p>	<p>The comment period for the RDEIR/SDEIS was extended by 60 days to October 30, 2015. Please see Master Response 57 for more information about the public review period. In order to facilitate a more easy review of the changes in the RDEIS/SDEIS compared to the Draft EIR/EIS, a version of the document was made available that included hyperlinks and track changes, in addition to a Section 508-compliant version.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>livelihood, and environment. The RDEIR/SDEIS amount to nearly 8,000 pages of additional documentation. Given the size and complexity of the document and the need to refer back to the initial 40,000 pages, the current public comment period is distressingly inadequate. The recent extension of the comment period, while helpful, remains inadequate for meaningful review and comment of the revised documents, which must be reviewed in the context of the original BDCP and without the benefit of response to our earlier comments. Both CEQA and NEPA require, at a minimum, a summarized and clearly defined project and impact report. Given the lengthy environmental documents, more time is necessary.</p> <p>The Delta counties, cities and towns are among the communities most affected by the proposed actions of the BDCP/California "WaterFix", and more time is needed to thoroughly review and comment on the recently released documents. On behalf of the Delta Counties Coalition and the Delta community, we respectfully request that the public comment period for the RDEIR/SDEIS be extended by, at least, another 60-days (deadline of December 29) in addition to the recently granted 60-day extension (deadline of October 30).</p>	
224	1	I am opposed to BDCP/California Water Fix options provided. Please pursue other options and consider the so called "west conveyance option".	Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7 regarding desalination, Master Response 6 regarding demand management and Master Response 37 regarding water storage.
225	1	The BDCP Tunnel Project is in the wrong location. Any project that withdraws water before it enters the Delta dooms the Delta into becoming a salt water marsh. All flows into the Delta need to be sustained to flow through the Delta so water flows sustain the environment, agriculture, and recreation. The only alternative to BDCP that provides for [flow] through [the] Delta is Dr. Robert Pyke's Western Delta Intake Concept (WDIC). [See ATT1:] WDIC would keep the Delta as healthy as possible and provide for potentially more water to be transferred south of the Delta than BDCP ever could at less cost and impact to the Delta environment. Please study at depth what WDIC would provide for. It is far and away a much more sound project for Delta water transfers.	<p>Please note that the preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A (i.e., the California WaterFix Project) and no longer includes an HCP. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives) and Master Response 37 (Storage) for additional information regarding why the West Delta diversion plan is beyond the purpose and scope of the proposed project.</p>
225	2	[ATT1: Description of Sherman Island Western Delta Intake Concept]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in the comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
225	3	[ATT1: ATT1 Map of Western Delta Intake Concept]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in the comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
226	1	<p>Solagra put in an alternative intake/conveyance proposal during the comment period for the DEIR/DEIS. To date there has been an evident evaluation of our West Delta (Sherman Island) proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We have a proposal that provides desalination of approximately one million acre feet of the State Water Project's average water shipments annual [sic]--new water.</li> <li>- We use a 23' tunnel to ship directly into Bethany Reservoir--avoiding use of banks (except during "Big Gulp" scenarios to store water in the San Joaquin Valley--probably in Tulare Lake). This increases freshwater flow through the Delta by avoiding banks--better Delta water quality.</li> <li>- We power the pumping, filtration/desalination with renewable power. We propose a public-private partnership with the State Water Project. Processing state water entitlements</li> </ul>	<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>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>on state land for SWP customers.</p> <p>- We have designed intakes to avoid harm to Delta and splittail or larger fish species.</p> <p>- NEPA/CEQA requires evaluation of alternatives--this has not yet been accomplished. Fatal flaw!</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 more than 25 million people and 3 million acres of farmland.</p> <p>Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. Local water agencies will need to invest in additional strategies and technologies, including desalination, to meet future water demand.</p> <p>The proposed project is one part of a diverse portfolio of strategies needed to meet California’s overall water management needs. It is not a substitute for increased commitments to other water supply solutions, including recycling, desalination, water conservation and storage.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 7 regarding desalination.</p> <p>Appendix 3A thoroughly explains why various proposals were not analyzed in the EIR/EIS, including the NRDC Portfolio-Based Proposal, Congressman Garamendi’s Water Plan, a proposal from the Water Advisory Committee of Orange County, the so-called Pyke proposal, and other similar concepts that would require actions that are beyond the scope of the proposed project. As explained in Appendix 3A, the Lead Agencies, in developing the EIR/EIS alternatives, considered all of these options, including potential desalination, and explained why such potential alternatives were not carried forward for detailed analysis in the EIR/EIS. SolAgra’s proposed West Delta Intake Plan (WDIP) is substantially similar to other proposals recommending the treatment of brackish or near-brackish water and the export of treated water from a location considerably downstream from the proposed North Delta diversion locations. The Lead Agencies have already considered and rejected such concepts for various reasons, including failure to achieve the project’s purposes, as well as costs and technical challenges. Notably, moreover, any diversion location that today is just near the point where fresh water mixes with brackish water will be subject to sea level rise over the coming decades. Such locations will be dealing with purely brackish water at some point in the future, substantially increasing treatment costs.</p> <p>By being located further upstream on the Sacramento River, the new diversions included under the proposed project would help protect critical water supplies against the threats of sea level rise and earthquakes, among numerous environmental benefits. As explained in EIR/EIS Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need, and Master Response 3, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need, the project objectives include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To make physical improvements to the conveyance system in anticipation of rising sea levels and other reasonably foreseeable consequences of climate change.</li> <li>• To make physical improvements to the conveyance system that will minimize the potential for public health and safety impacts resulting from a major earthquake that causes breaching of Delta levees and the inundation of brackish water into the areas in which the SWP and CVP pumping plants operate in the southern Delta.</li> </ul> <p>Locating new intakes in the western Delta at the mixing zone of high-salinity water and freshwater outflows, as proposed by the commenter, would not achieve these objectives.</p> <p>The Final EIR analyzes 18 project alternatives representing a reasonable range of alternatives for CEQA and NEPA purposes. For more information regarding alternatives to the proposed project please see Master Response 4 (Alternatives Development).</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Please note that Alternative 4A, also known as California WaterFix, has been developed in response to public and agency input and is the new CEQA Preferred Alternative. Alternative 4A is also the NEPA Preferred Alternative, a designation that was not attached to any of the alternatives presented in the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS. Alternative 4 (BDCP) remains a potentially viable alternative and was carried forward in this RDEIR/SDEIS and Final EIR/EIS because it represents the original habitat conservation plan/natural community conservation plan (HCP/NCCP) alternative approach, and because it provides an important reference point from which the Alternative 4A, 2D, and 5A descriptions and analyses were developed and presented for public and agency review and comment in the RDEIR/SDEIS. If the Lead Agencies ultimately choose the alternative implementation strategy and select an alternative analyzed in the RDEIR/SDEIS and Final EIR/EIS after completing the CEQA and NEPA processes, elements of the conservation plan contained in the alternatives in the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS may be utilized by other programs for implementation of the long term conservation efforts. For further responses to comments on the BDCP, please see Master Response 5 (BDCP).</p> <p>The Lead Agencies appreciate the commenter’s desire to assist the State in its water management challenges. The commenter has devised a commendable concept for desalinating brackish water through solar power. Going forward, projects of this kind may be important parts of the overall water supply solution for California. The use of solar power would make them consistent with the State’s climate policies. Depending on the particular circumstances facing a particular water agency, such a project could well be feasible. But, in the context of fixing the problems facing the State Water Project as one part of the State’s overall water infrastructure, the concept of a major desalination project significantly downstream from the proposed locations of the three diversion structures associated with the proposed California Water Fix has previously been carefully considered, although none of these proposals was identical to what the commenter is suggesting. Such a concept was not carried forward for full analysis. Please refer to Master Response 4 and Appendix 3A of the EIR/EIS for additional details on the selection of alternatives.</p> <p>The alternatives included in the EIR/EIS represent a legally adequate reasonable range of alternatives and the scope of the analysis of alternatives fully complies with both CEQA and NEPA. The specific proposals that were considered by the Lead Agencies are discussed in Appendix 3A of the EIR/EIS. Appendix 3A explains why various proposals were not analyzed in the EIR/EIS, including concepts that include diversion facilities near Rio Vista, including a potential alternative with an intake at Sherman Island and intakes near City of Antioch. The ability to divert water in the western Delta (e.g., near Rio Vista, Antioch, Decker Island, or Sherman Island) could be limited due to the presence of delta smelt in the winter and spring months by requirements of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife. In July through November, salinity could be too high for use by the SWP and CVP facilities, especially as sea level rise progresses. It should be noted that Delta exports are diverted for conveyance through both SWP Banks Pumping Plant and CVP Jones Pumping Plant to provide over 6.6 million acre-feet/year in wet years.</p> <p>Please also see Master Response 3 for information on the purpose and need for the proposed project. 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 diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. 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. It is intended to improve both in-Delta and export water quality.</p>
227	1	We are concerned that no formal presentation or overview of the project was provided and	The commenter raises issues related to the format of the public meetings. There is no specific meeting

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>it's upon the general public to acquire the information through other sources. Reading the document may not be one of those sources. The project is complex and technical and will impact the Delta and Delta residents without regard to adequately analyzing alternatives to a thru Delta conveyance.</p> <p>Because the project is complex we found it difficult to find the right agency staff to answer our questions. Most of our time was spent standing and waiting --not very effective. I would encourage agency staff to provide a workshop that contains an overview of the project and specific highlights as an additional outreach.</p>	<p>format required under CEQA or NEPA. An overview brochure as well as the Executive Summary were available as handouts and numerous members of the project team were available to answer specific questions from meeting attendees. For more information on the public outreach efforts made during the BDCP and EIR/EIS process, please see Chapter 32 of the EIR/EIS and Master Response 40. For additional information about how this project has been developed in an open and transparent manner, please refer to Master Response 41.</p>
228	1	What is the plan on protecting the water species from harm as well as the other wildlife that depend on the Delta?	Chapter 11 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect aquatic species. This chapter describes the impacts on aquatic species, both negative and positive, and discusses measures that would be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts on aquatic species and to compensate for significant impacts.
228	2	What will be the negative impacts on all of us as small business farmers who have a lot to lose from the impact this could have on the agricultural areas on the Delta?	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. While the compensation to property owners would reduce the severity of economic effects related to the loss of agricultural land, it would not constitute mitigation for any related physical impact.
229	1	Who came up with the "temporary rock barriers" on Steamboat Slough? We live on that slough and your idea eliminates are ability to boat to Rio Vista by river. Who compensates homeowners who lose ability to use river as our families have for many years? Does anyone care about our property values--how are we to be compensated for adverse effects?	Please note that Steamboat Slough is more than 3 miles away from the construction footprint of the preferred alternative, 4A. River access would be maintained throughout the project. Anglers could move to other locations along the Sacramento River and throughout the Delta region and REC-2 would provide anglers with alternative bank fishing access sites further removed from areas affected by construction. When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the proposed project.
229	2	If you are going to block a waterway, why not the shipping channel to Sacramento? Maybe 10 ships per year go up and down. Trucking rice to port of Oakland and installing "temporary rock barriers" on Cache Slough would save steamboat slough residents our waterway.	Please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A. This alternative would not block waterway the Steamboat Slough waterway or entail construction along Steamboat Slough. Please refer to Section 4 and the updated Chapter 3, Project Description, in the RDEIR/SDEIS.
230	1	Stop the tunnels!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
231	1	Stop the tunnels, put the project up to a vote.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
231	2	Stop spending taxpayer money on a pipe dream. Spend it on conservation and educating the public instead of throwing money away that only a few will benefit from.	The commenter does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.
232	1	I find it outrageous and unthinkable that our "eco-friendly" governor has disregarded his critics of this plan in such arrogant terms. (You know what I mean). I even voted for him at least 3 times.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
232	2	<p>I find it hard to believe that the Delta and the surrounding areas won't be severely damaged. And at what cost? The \$15 billion is bound to balloon--and then the cost of the delivered what will be [sic] exorbitant--maybe more than the southern farmers will be willing to pay or find economically sane to pay. Then who will have to pay--we, the taxpayers will get the brunt of it.</p> <p>The whole thing looks like it's sacrificing the Delta to save a few rich farmers down south who may even change their [unreadable] on it.</p> <p>It doesn't provide any more water.</p> <p>It doesn't solve the drought.</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. 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>Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), and Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding).</p>
233	1	<p>I am a 4th generation Delta resident, age 65 years. I have lived in the area around the city of Isleton my entire life. I have watched the agriculture interests and farming on Sherman Island be destroyed by salt water intrusion. I do not wish to see this happen to our other Delta farmers who live on other islands. The Delta agriculture soil is some of the richest in the world. To divert more Delta water south will create more salt water intrusion to the Delta farmlands, many who have been in business for 100 years. The southern agriculture interests in the Westlands Irrigation District were originally informed not to put in tree crops but to only put in grain and one-year crops that could be given additional water from the Delta if there was extra. They have ignored that and are now demanding year-round, every year water, pitting Delta farmers against them as well as Delta fisheries.</p>	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS.</p>
233	2	<p>I do not believe the tunnels can successfully cover the water needs of the Delta and the Southern area. Therefore I am opposed to the construction of them because of saltwater Delta intrusion.</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>The premise of the California WaterFix is that it will provide environmental benefits while stabilizing water supplies for a large population of California residents, consistent with statutory policy as found in the Delta Reform Act of 2009 (see, e.g., California Public Resources Code, §§ 85001(c), 85002, 85004(a), 85020.) Refer to Master Response 31 (Compliance with the Delta Reform Act).</p> <p>Regulatory water quality objectives (or guidance values) exist for these constituents for protection of agricultural water supply, municipal and industrial drinking water supply, and fish and wildlife beneficial uses.</p> <p>Please also refer to Master Response 14 (Water Quality) and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>
234	1	<p>When the State water project was built originally why was the water drawn from the south Delta? Why wasn't it drawn from the northern Delta where the proposed tunnels are planning to draw?</p>	<p>As described in Appendix 3A of the EIR/EIS, the placement of the CVP and subsequently the SWP Delta export facilities in the southern Delta was selected to meet the initial criteria of conveying large quantities of water across the Delta to reduce salinity in the Delta and deliver water to the San Francisco Bay Area without harm to other portions of the Delta and Suisun Bay. At that time, effects on the aquatic resources in the Delta were not well understood.</p>
235	1	<p>After reading through many water quality sections of this RDEIR/SDEIS, one of the main complaints I have is how poorly it is written and put together. First off, the size of this whole</p>	<p>The size and complexity of these drafts reflect an unprecedented effort to analyze a proposed project under both state and federal laws for endangered species along with 17 other action alternatives. For more</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		plan is ridiculous, 40,000 pages... who will be able to read that and get the entire picture? No one! The way it has been revised feels like a teacher graded one of my papers --crossed out sections and added revisions in red. The simple fact of how large the EIR for the tunnels construction and implementation is, is concerning.	information regarding the document's length and complexity please see Master Response 38.  The lead agencies believe that the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS and 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS are complete in their evaluation of impacts (using the best available science and modeling), direct and cumulative, that project description is complete and satisfies the requirements of NEPA, and that the project objectives are also precise and complete and satisfy the requirements of CEQA. The lead agencies believe that the 2013 Public Draft EIR/EIS and 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS provided the public and decision-makers with sufficient information on which to make informed comments which have been considered and incorporated into the Final EIR/EIS.
235	2	Something that should in theory be helping or at least not hindering the Delta, shouldn't have this many possible environmental impacts. However, when it's a project this massive, it makes sense... but that doesn't make it "the best" choice. We do not have to build the tunnels. I agree there has been a lot of work and good science put into the project, but no one knows what the tunnels will do to the Delta.	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 with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.
235	3	There are other options such as just fixing what we already have in terms of pumping stations, conveyance systems and management of Delta habitat/levees/communities.	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.
235	4	There are mistakes in this RDEIR/SDEIS, such as GW-7 is actually never discussed!	As described in Chapter 1 of the RDEIR/SDEIS, the RDEIR/SDEIS only presents new information and addresses project revisions that occurred following publication of the Draft EIR/EIS. The Final EIR/EIS includes all portions of the document including changes that were completed following publication of both the Draft EIR/EIS and the RDEIR/SDEIS.
235	5	Just like countless other places devastated by big water projects around the world, do not make the people, communities, habitat, and future of the Delta go through the same.	The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.  Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project.
236	1	What will happen to everything above the tunnels? Delta soil shifts [and] sinks so much, literally within months there are new cracks in roads and other pavements. It is impossible to really know what would happen to Delta land because of these massive tunnels, but I can't imagine it would be good. [Talk] about causing levee breaks because of seismic activity, this project would greatly contribute to that, it seems!	Regarding the part of the comment pertaining to ground settlement, the potential for ground settlement caused by tunneling activities is described in Impact GEO-3 in Chapter 9. GEO-3 also describes how the results of site-specific geotechnical investigations would be applied to the development of geotechnical design and construction recommendations to minimize the potential effects from settlement.  Regarding the part of the comment pertaining to seismically-induced levee failure, the existing hazard of seismically-induced levee failure caused by liquefaction is described in Section 9.1.1.4.3 in Chapter 9.  All new levees that would be constructed and all existing levees that would be modified by the project would be constructed or upgraded to a level of stability that complies with current regulatory design standards, such that the project would not contribute to an increased hazard of levee failure or breaching compared to the existing condition.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
236	2	I hope you actually read [and] keep these comments. We don't feel like you give us much of a voice or look at how we also need the water.	Consistent with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA Guidelines §15088) and the National Environmental Policy Act (Council on Environmental Quality § 1503.4) and policies held by all Lead Agencies governing the implementation of CEQA and NEPA, all comments received on the DEIR/EIS and RDEIR/SDEIS are included with the Final EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 42 regarding treatment of public comments.
237	1	This meeting is to discuss the "California Water Fix." It is my understanding that the problem in California is there is not enough water for all the needs. How can the tunnels be the fix when they don't generate one drop of water?	<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 with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
238	1	<p>One of the dialogs at Walnut Grove showed the capacity of the system to be 36,000 cubic feet per second≈1 acre feet per second. Outside of flood time there is no way this capacity is needed unless a large additional supply of water is made available. I am therefore convinced that this tunnel plan is only part A of a Z part plan much like proposed at the time of the previous tunnel plan. Part B must get water from the Eel or Trinity River. There is no other way to:</p> <p>A. Justify the capacity of the tunnel.</p> <p>B. Satisfy the South Wally farmers without drying up the Delta.</p> <p>C. Get enough regular water.</p>	<p>The total amount of water exported by month in each water year type for each action alternative is presented in Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Model Results, of the EIR/EIS. As shown in Appendix 5A, Section C, the north Delta intake tunnels would not be fully utilized except for a few months in wet years. However, it is important to have the maximum capacity in the intakes and tunnels (up to 9,000 cfs) 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 north Delta intakes would have minimal flows that would be required for maintenance of the pumps during critical dry years.</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 reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal and State regulating agencies, ESA compliance, and project design. 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. Over the long-term, 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 exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods. The project does not include new facilities or water rights to increase diversions for the SWP and/or CVP from any rivers, including Eel and Trinity rivers.</p>
238	2	I think it best that California plan on more prolonged drought years (even if we have a wet year or two) and find ways to send more water through the Delta instead of less. The large orchards in the south have to find other ways to get more water and we need to find more	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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		ways to allow fresh water to flow through the marsh and into the Bay.	<p>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. Providing regulatory oversight to agribusinesses is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via WaterFix's proposed conveyance facilities. Contractors and their customers must make economic decisions about planting in light of the amounts of water they are likely to receive going forward.</p>
239	1	<p>The open house sponsored by BDCP represents yet one more attempt to sell the tunnel project that will have a negative impact on the water reliability and ecosystem in the North Delta. Further, this open house will be used as a media trick.</p> <p>I attended the last meeting in Walnut Grove, met with DWR and was promised answers to my "good questions." Although I provided all of my contact information, I did not receive the promised response.</p>	<p>The Lead Agencies will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3. For more information regarding public comment responses please see Master Response 42.</p> <p>The lead agencies made every effort to follow up with individuals requesting additional information. Various public outreach materials provided the email address and hotline number by which individuals could follow up on requests. The public open house meetings provided attendees the opportunity to provide comments in writing on comment cards or verbally with a court reporter.</p>
239	2	During this drought year, the low water level and abundance of aquatic weeds seem like a preview of post-tunnel damage.	As described in the RDEIR/SEIS, operational criteria for the preferred alternative are intended to minimize the potential for effects to listed fishes. Analyses conducted for the public draft BDCP suggested that the potential for greater aquatic weed coverage (specifically, Brazilian waterweed, <i>Egeria densa</i> ) were generally limited to areas near proposed tidal habitat restoration areas (see Section 5.F.4.2.4.3 Water Velocity in Appendix 5.F). Under the BDCP, such effects would be mitigated by CM13 Invasive Aquatic Vegetation Control. However, note that extensive tidal habitat restoration is not proposed under the preferred alternative, suggesting that greater aquatic weed coverage would not occur under the preferred alternative.
239	3	It has become years of hearing about various tunnel "water fins." This plan does not fix anything. The end result would be more water for some areas, less water in the North Tunnel and the destruction of habitat, farming communities and individual and family lives.	<p>Regarding the concerns related to the effects to habitat, the proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the Clean Water Act as well as federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The effects of the project on agricultural resources were extensively addressed in the EIR/S. Impacts were evaluated and mitigation proposed to mediate the adverse effects. It was concluded that the effects to agriculture were significant and unmitigated. Under CEQA, the state will be required to adopt overriding considerations for these effects. The EIR/S did include the following mitigations measures:</p> <p>AG-1: Develop an Agricultural Lands Stewardship Plan (ALSP) to maintain agricultural productivity and mitigate for loss of Important Farmland and land subject to Williamson Act contracts or in Farmland Security Zones</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>GW-1: Maintain water supplies in areas affected by construction dewatering</p> <p>GW-5: Agricultural lands seepage minimization</p> <p>WQ-11: Avoid, minimize, or offset, as feasible, reduced water quality conditions</p> <p>AG-1: Develop an Agricultural Lands Stewardship Plan (ALSP) to maintain agricultural productivity and mitigate for loss of Important Farmland and land subject to Williamson Act contracts or in Farmland Security Zones</p> <p>AG-1: Develop an Agricultural Lands Stewardship Plan (ALSP) to maintain agricultural productivity and mitigate for loss of Important Farmland and land subject to Williamson Act contracts or in Farmland Security Zones</p> <p>GW-5: Agricultural lands seepage minimization</p> <p>Please see RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix A Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, Impact AG-1 and Impact AG-2 and their associated mitigation measures for complete analysis of how the proposed project will effect and mediate important farmland in the Delta.</p>
240	1	Stop all work on tunnels. Stop thinking about taking water from the Delta and Northern California.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
240	2	Fund [illegible] more storage reservoirs now. Stop "studying" ideas and take action.	Although conservation components and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the BDCP or California WaterFix. It is important to note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, water recycling, etc. Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the BDCP/California WaterFix or FEIR/EIS. For more information regarding demand management please see Master Response 6. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master Response 3.
240	3	Use funds planned for any bullet-train--e.g. Fresno to Bakersfield--for building reservoirs.	The commenter does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.
241	1	<p>In March 19, 2012, reporter Wyatt Buchanan of the S.F. Gate.com wrote that "according to initial documents released for... the Bay Delta conservation plan, building two large tunnels under the Delta... would cost nearly \$17 billion. That cost includes both the construction of the project and the cost to operate and maintain it for 50 years. Including interest on the bonds for the project, the total construction cost would near \$40 billion.</p> <p>In a Special to the Bee, UOP economist Jeffrey Michael and Dr. Robert Pyke, Ph.D. (March 25, 2012) write: "The Bay Delta Conservation Plan's direct cost exceed \$23 billion, not including interest and the cost to the Delta."</p> <p>In a Special to the Bee of May 13, 2012, M. David Stirling wrote: "State Department of Water Resources officials estimate the tunnel project will cost a minimum of \$14 billion."</p> <p>For the past three years the State water officials have been using the figure \$15 billion as the costs of the tunnels project.</p> <p>My question is: When will the State officials come out with a more realistic, honest estimate</p>	Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on costs of project implementation.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>of the total costs of constructing the tunnels project, including all likely elements of the project, i.e., 10-15 years to build; the fact that nothing before --not even the Chunnel-- has been this big; the eminent domain legal costs to acquire private property; the damage to farmland and to the businesses and residents of the Delta both during construction and after; and finally, the cost of the damage to the ecosystem of the Delta. (Part of this project was the preserve fish species such as the so-called bell-weather Delta smelt. After 10-15 years of construction, the Delta smelt will be a distant memory.)</p> <p>The water agencies, Delta businesses and residents, and all taxpayers and ratepayers deserve to know the total, honest costs of the whole tunnels project.</p>	
242	1	<p>Our farm intake is located in Elk Slough. Will the water stage level change in Elk Slough? A change in water stage level may require infrastructure changes at our pump station. Costs with permitting and construction to change our pump station may be large. How will this be mitigated?</p>	<p>Water elevations in Elk Slough would be affected under the action alternatives as compared to the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative in a similar manner as shown in Appendix 5A, Section C, in the Final EIR/EIS, for the Sacramento River at Freeport and along Steamboat Slough downstream of Sutter Slough. Effects associated with changes in water surface hydrodynamics related to availability of water for agricultural and community uses are addressed in Chapter 14, Agricultural Resources, and Chapter 20, Public Services and Utilities, respectively.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure AG-1a: Promote Agricultural Productivity of Important Farmland, would reduce adverse effects and/or significant impacts related to conversion of Important Farmland and land subject to Williamson Act contracts or in Farmland Security Zones to non-agricultural uses. This mitigation would include mitigation on site, which covers temporarily impacted and permanently impacted diversions, and could include providing alternate water supply for temporarily impacted diversions, or relocating and/or replacing wells, pipelines, drainage systems and other infrastructure needed for ongoing agricultural uses, which would be adversely affected by project construction or operation.</p>
242	2	<p>Has water quality, including dissolved oxygen and electrical conductance, been modeled in Elk Slough? Changes in water quality (reduced oxygen levels or increased electrical conductance) may prevent us from farming. Even minor changes in electrical conductance could change crop yields. How will this be mitigated?</p>	<p>The assessment of dissolved oxygen effects in the Delta due to the project alternatives was conducted qualitatively, thus, no modeling was conducted. A dissolved oxygen model that addresses spatial and time scales of the assessment (16 year period DSM2 simulation) and would inform the dissolved oxygen discussions is not currently developed.</p> <p>Regarding electrical conductivity (EC), the assessment focused on changes in EC at Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan (WQCP) compliance locations, which were established by the State Water Resources Control Board for the protection of agricultural beneficial uses. Because Elk Slough is not a WQCP compliance location, EC results have not been presented or evaluated in the EIR/S. Effects to agricultural beneficial uses were determined through evaluating changes in EC levels and compliance with objectives at WQCP locations.</p>
242	3	<p>Has groundwater recharge been modeled for the Clarksburg area? Changes in water levels of underground [aquifers] could cause our well to go dry. A dry well means no water for our residences. How will this be mitigated?</p>	<p>Results from groundwater modeling for Delta are presented in Chapter 7 and Appendix 7A in the EIR/EIS for construction of intakes, tunnel shafts, and forebay levees without installation of slurry walls. These results indicated that groundwater in the Clarksburg area could be affected during construction due to dewatering activities if slurry walls were not installed. In the Final EIR/EIS the description of the proposed project, Alternative 4A, was modified to include slurry wall installation to protect local groundwater conditions under construction. Slurry walls would be constructed around the construction site at the intakes, tunnel shafts, and forebays to reduce the effect of dewatering wells. Dewatering wells also would be installed at construction sites associated with levees without the use of slurry walls. No dewatering would be required along the tunnel alignment. The effects on groundwater at locations with slurry wall installations would not result in significant effects as compared to Existing Conditions. It is possible, that some impacts may result in effects depending upon specific information that would be collected during design and construction phase. Mitigation measures have been identified in the EIR/EIS to reduce the impacts to less than significant as compared to Existing Conditions. Mitigation Measures AG-1, GW-1, GW-5, and WQ-11 will reduce the</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			severity of significant impacts in agricultural areas by implementing activities such as siting project footprints to encourage continued agricultural production; monitoring changes in groundwater levels during construction; monitoring seepage effects; relocating or replacing agricultural infrastructure in support of continued agricultural activities; identifying, evaluating, developing, and implementing feasible phased actions to reduce EC levels; engaging counties, owners/operators, and other stakeholders in developing optional agricultural stewardship approaches; and/or preserving agricultural land through off-site easements or other agricultural land conservation interests.
243	1	<p>When I look over the outline of this massive project one thought comes to mind.</p> <p>Page One of the Bible: call it the "Big Bang" but it was God's voice creating our planet.</p> <p>Page Two of the Bible: God describes his creation and how he made it for our enjoyment.</p> <p>Page Three of the Bible and all the rest: how we made it a train wreck and still are today.</p> <p>The Delta's formation over 10,000 years ago is a constant focus of over-utilization by man. [Can] we [not] perhaps look to leaving it alone? Stop pumping and levee-building? Perhaps nationally protest it? Low water rates and over water use in the southern Valley and southern California need to stop and find a balance. The Delta should not pay the price for misuse, political posturing, and greed.</p>	The commenter suggests leaving the delta alone and addressing the issue of over water use in southern California. Refer to Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
244	1	How will these tunnels help in drought years? Assuming prior water rights and public trust needs will be met first, how much water will be available for export in a drought?	<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 shown in Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Model Results, of the EIR/EIS, the north Delta intake tunnels would not be fully utilized except for periods of time when the Sacramento River flows are higher than in drought years. 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.</p> <p>The proposed project also 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>
244	2	The 2009 Delta Reform Act mandates a reduction [in] Delta imports. How does the California WaterFix achieve that?	The EIR/S was prepared in a manner to comply with the 2009 Delta Reform Act, as described in Appendix 3I, BDCP Compliance with the 2009 Delta Reform Act, of the EIR/S. The range of alternatives in the EIR/S 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. However, SWP and CVP water deliveries would continue under all alternatives.
244	3	Isn't the majority of the habitat designated under California EcoRestore for mitigation for the 2008 Biological Opinions? Isn't that habitat for damage already done to the Delta? The new tunnels project, which includes less than 2,000 acres for mitigation habitat, clearly does not comply with the coequal goals of water supply reliability and ecosystem restoration mandated in the 2009 Delta Reform Act.	The commenter is asking a question about California EcoRestore and its relationship to the 2008 Biological Opinions. EcoRestore does include implementation of the required mitigation for the State Water Project and Central Valley Project. California EcoRestore is unassociated with any of the proposed habitat restoration under Alternatives 2D, 4A, and 5A in the EIR/EIS but does include much of the BDCP conservation strategy presented in the HCP/NCCP alternatives.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
244	4	Exactly where does the water for the tunnels come from? What impact will this have in that area?	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The action alternatives would only deliver the amount of water diverted under the existing SWP and CVP water rights and the existing and future related regulatory requirements based upon river water levels and flow, water available in the system, the presence of threatened and endangered fish species, and water quality standards. The alternatives do not change diversion of senior water rights and continue to meet instream flow requirements.</p> <p>The project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities, including operations to protect water quality, can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see <a href="http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml">http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml</a>) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see <a href="http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html">http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html</a>).</p>
244	5	What will be the impact of brackish water in the west Delta when the tunnels are pumping? How will that impact the ecology and economy in the west Delta area?	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 bromide (Impact WQ-5), 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. Impacts to biological resources were addressed in the EIR/EIS in Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Resources, and Chapter 12, Terrestrial Biological Resources. Socioeconomics are addressed in the EIR/EIS in Chapter 16.
244	6	What specific plans are there for containing and eliminating contamination from the enormous piles of soil (70 miles [by] 40 feet) which are slated to be simply dumped on various Delta islands?	Please see Appendix 3B, Environmental Commitments, Section 3B.2.18.5, for a detailed discussion of measures that would be implemented for the disposal and potential reuse of reusable tunnel material, spoils and dredged material.
245	1	<p>Why are we only approaching the water issue from a conveyance perspective?</p> <p>In order to address long term water criteria I would think that conservation in conjunction with additional storage facilities will be required in order to secure water in drought or wet seasons.</p> <p>Storage protects and prevents, regular supplies.</p> <p>Conservation is achieved through education and technology.</p>	<p>Although conservation components and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the BDCP or California WaterFix. It is important to note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, water recycling, etc.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the BDCP/California WaterFix or FEIR/EIS. For more information regarding the development of alternatives and demand management please see Master Response 4 and 6, respectively.</p>
245	2	<p>The tunnels and the method of funding are suspicious at best. We are doing nothing but copying a 3000 year old roman practice of moving water.</p> <p>This is California, Silicon Valley and the 7th largest economy in the world, "We can do better than this".</p>	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS 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

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Keep the political agenda off the table and allow the experts to plan this project for their grandchildren.	criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility.
246	1	<p>When will the new water quality analysis be done on 4A?</p> <p>I am looking for the impact [on] water downstream of the intake and before the western Delta (Hood to Rio Vista).</p> <p>It seems reduced river flows would increase salinity and decrease [dissolved oxygen]. I would like to see these impacts quantified.</p>	<p>The water quality assessment of the impacts of Alternative 4A on the Delta and its upstream tributaries, including the Sacramento River was provided in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS in Section 4.3.4, Water Quality. Additional response regarding the assessment approach for dissolved oxygen and water quality changes in the Sacramento River in the vicinity of the intakes is provided in Master Response 30.</p>
247	1	The state needs to come up with a plan that will actually create new water, not reallocate it from one region to another.	<p>It is important to note, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 5 for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The premise of the California WaterFix is that it will provide environmental benefits while stabilizing water supplies for a large population of California residents, consistent with statutory policy as found in the Delta Reform Act of 2009 (see, e.g., California Public Resources Code, §§ 85001(c), 85002, 85004(a), 85020.) Refer to Master Response 31 (Compliance with the Delta Reform Act).</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.</p> <p>Although many of the proposed alternatives included meritorious water policy principles, the proposals rejected by the Lead Agencies did not qualify as appropriate alternatives for various reasons. For example, proposals were rejected because they were inconsistent with the project's objectives and purpose and need or included components that are beyond the scope of the project. The text of the Draft EIR/EIS in Chapter 3 (section 3.2) and Appendix 3A to that document thoroughly explain the process used to develop the alternatives, and explain why certain potential alternatives were considered but ultimately rejected by the Lead Agencies.</p> <p>Please also refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
247	2	The plan to divert the Sacramento River around the Delta is the mother of all boondoggles. The final tab will exceed \$50 billion and it will destroy the California Delta. In human history there has never been a project like this that has not destroyed the parent waterway.	<p>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. Resource areas are addressed separately under sections for each of the new project Alternatives, including surface water, groundwater, water quality, fish and aquatic resources, terrestrial biological resources, agricultural resources, air quality and greenhouse gases, and others. Where impacts are determined to be significant, environmental commitments and mitigation measures will be implemented to avoid and/or offset these effects, where possible. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 5 (Cost).</p>
248	1	I am against the tunnel. I have been raised in the Hood [and] Elk Grove area my whole life. It is a sacred land to my Miwok people. I have witnessed the harm of our salmon [and] our	The commenter's opinion related to the DEIR/S is acknowledged. For additional information about Native American outreach efforts, including identification and analysis of impacts on archaeological sites,

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		people dying of disease caused by the settlers. It will destroy the villages and burial sites, [or] what is left of them. We are descendants of the water people and the villages that will be destroyed, as well as the marsh levees, will be taken away and wipe out the last historical preservation that we can hold sacred. We are already seeing issues with brown water and to have our salmon redirected in order for this tunnel to come will destroy what is left! We already see farm-raised salmon with dye; this is not the way of our people. Our sister tribes are against the tunnel and the desecration of our people as well. We cannot allow our tribal lands to be disrupted in order to give water to other areas. This is not the way our people [handle] the Earth. We will continue [to] fight to see this project does not go through.	Traditional Cultural Properties, and cultural significance of biological resources, please see Master Response 20.
249	1	It is unbelievable that a governor (Jerry Brown) has recreated the tunnels to pull monies for export of water from northern California to send to mega-farmers south (Resnick). What other politicians are getting pockets filled with greed of water? Follow the monies. I will never again eat a pistachio or almond grown in southern California with northern California water.	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. 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. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water).
249	2	Now at retirement age I am once again revisiting Jerry Brown, Governor's water export idea without the vote of the people who trusted in his leadership. It seems his actions on twin tunnels are of a governor who is lacking in common sense and does not hear or wish to hear no to twin tunnels. Save the Delta.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
250	1	How can this plan go ahead after the EPA has already turned it down and how can you get away with lying to the voters that no Prop 2 money would go to finance the tunnels-pipes project?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
251	1	Hood Water/Wells:  How will the pipelines that come from the intakes north of Hood and that travel directly into and through our water table/wells [affect] the availability/quality of our water? Is there mitigation?	The tunnel would be installed approximately 100 to 150 feet below the ground surface. No dewatering or other construction activities would occur along the tunnel alignment except at the tunnel shaft sites. In the Final EIR/EIS the description of the proposed project, Alternative 4A, was modified to include slurry wall installation to protect local groundwater conditions under construction including at tunnel shaft locations. The effects on groundwater at locations with slurry wall installations would not result in significant effects as compared to Existing Conditions. It is possible, that some impacts may result in effects depending upon specific information that would be collected during design and construction phase. Mitigation measures have been identified in the EIR/EIS to reduce the impacts to less than significant as compared to Existing Conditions. Mitigation Measures AG-1, GW-1, GW-5, and WQ-11 will reduce the severity of significant impacts in agricultural areas by implementing activities such as siting project footprints to encourage continued agricultural production; monitoring changes in groundwater levels during construction; monitoring seepage effects; relocating or replacing agricultural infrastructure in support of continued agricultural activities; identifying, evaluating, developing, and implementing feasible phased actions to reduce EC levels; engaging counties, owners/operators, and other stakeholders in developing optional agricultural stewardship approaches; and/or preserving agricultural land through off-site easements or other agricultural land conservation interests.
251	2	Hood-Franklin Road:  Just west of the trestle/bridge on the east side of Hood:  -access to staging area  -access to intake/pumps north of Hood  Why drive through Hood? [Construction] access [via] roads on trestle [and] levee roads?	Prior to construction, the lead agencies will ensure development of site-specific construction traffic management plans (TMPs) that address the specific steps to be taken before, during, and after construction to minimize traffic impacts, including the mitigation measures and environmental commitments identified in this EIR/EIS. This will include potential expansion of the study area identified in this EIR/EIS to capture all potentially significantly affected roadway segments. Mitigation Measure TRANS-1c also seeks to work with affected jurisdictions to enhance capacity of congested roadway segments where construction traffic will substantially affect transportation facilities.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
251	3	[ATT 1: Diagram of the town of Hood.]	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in the comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
252	1	<p>The plan needs to be replaced with the following one:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Retire drainage-impaired lands on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley.</li> <li>2. Increase flows throughout the Delta.</li> <li>3. Repair and bolster levees.</li> <li>4. Analyze how much water is really available [and] get rid of paper water.</li> <li>5. Adopt Responsible Exports Plan of the Environmental Water Caucus (EWC).</li> </ol>	<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. The specific proposals that were considered but ultimately rejected by the Lead Agencies are discussed in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1. Appendix 3A thoroughly explains why various proposals were not analyzed in the EIR/EIS, including the NRDC Portfolio-Based Proposal, Congressman Garamendi's Water Plan, and other similar concepts that would require actions that are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The alternatives included in the EIR/EIS represent a legally adequate reasonable range of alternatives and the scope of the analysis of alternatives fully complies with both CEQA and NEPA. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.</p> <p>For more information regarding supplemental modeling by the SWRCB related to increased delta outflows please see Appendix 5E of the FEIR/EIS.</p>
253	1	<p>Nothing in this plan talks about southern California and south San Joaquin Valley developing a plan to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Fund and build water storage areas in southern California or [implement] water abatement practices.</li> <li>b. Fund and implement water mandates for reduction in each zip code, no matter how affluent.</li> <li>c. [Fund] water conservation incentives to educate farmers, homeowners, and businesses on known methods of reducing current water usage.</li> </ol>	<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>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>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <p>For more information regarding beneficial use please see Master Response 34. The proposed project does not make determinations regarding how water delivered through the proposed project conveyance, California Aqueduct, Delta Mendota Canal, or other water conveyance facility will be put to a beneficial use.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>The proposed project would be operated as a component of the State Water Project (SWP) and would be used to help convey SWP, CVP, and transfer water to contracted water users. As indicated in the FEIR/FEIS, the operation of the new conveyance facilities includes diverting water through the new north delta diversion facilities or through the existing south delta water diversion facilities. It is outside the scope of the proposed project (and in fact, outside the purview of the lead agencies) to make determinations regarding what constitutes a beneficial use or modify stipulations in water service contracts between the DWR and the SWP contractors, Reclamation and their contractors, and between water transfer sellers and buyers.</p>
253	2	<p>This plan, as a "California Fix," serves only to benefit multiple other special interests and tunnels underneath the Bay Delta.</p>	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
253	3	<p>There is only one way to keep water quality and flow in the Bay Delta. That is to continue to conserve water all over the state. We cannot control rainfall. Taking more water out of the Bay Delta with tunnels does nothing but increase salinity [and] reduce groundwater quality and the aquatic ecosystem.</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). It is projected that Delta exports from the federal and state water projects would either remain similar or increase in wetter years and decrease in drier years under Alternative 4A as compared to exports under No Action Alternative (ELT) depending on the capability to divert water at the north Delta intakes during winter and spring months. The estimated changes in deliveries for 4A are provided in the Section 4.3.1 and Appendix A Chapter 5 Water Supply. Although exports under the preferred alternative would be similar to the amount water exported in recent history, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while reducing other stressors on the ecological functions of the Delta.</p> <p>For more information regarding water supply please see Master Response 35.</p>
254	1	<p>This plan mimics the Australia Plan which solved a problem for them. It may have been a plan that would have worked better in the 50s when we could have built pipes that would have saved source water. It is not a plan California should adopt or pay for.</p>	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p>
254	2	<p>The need for this plan is only because southern California never adopted planned growth. Going forward, the same goals can be accomplished by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All future development submitting plans in each community that explain how the project will be water neutral. Most communities meter water use and show reductions in one area to justify expansion in another that is environmentally responsible.</li> <li>2. All water regulations and permits should be reviewed for legality and a new environmentally sound system proposed, not tunnels.</li> </ol>	<p>The commenter does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
255	1	<p>The documents online indicated the use of dewatering wells along the alignment but the people at the community meeting said they would not use dewatering wells. Will they use them or not? If they do and a well on private property does not recover, what will be done to address it?</p>	<p>The tunnel would be installed approximately 100 to 150 feet below the ground surface. No dewatering or other construction activities would occur along the tunnel alignment except at the tunnel shaft sites. In the Final EIR/EIS the description of the proposed project, Alternative 4A, was modified to include slurry wall installation to protect local groundwater conditions under construction including at tunnel shaft locations. The effects on groundwater at locations with slurry wall installations would not result in significant effects as compared to Existing Conditions. Temporary dewatering activities could occur along the pipeline. The dewatering would occur in the immediate vicinity of the open trench along the pipeline alignment; and dewatering would cease as the trench is backfilled. It is possible, that some impacts may result in effects depending upon specific information that would be collected during design and construction phase. Mitigation measures have been identified in the EIR/EIS to reduce the impacts to less than significant as compared to Existing Conditions. Mitigation Measures AG-1, GW-1, GW-5, and WQ-11 will reduce the severity of significant impacts in agricultural areas by implementing activities such as siting project footprints</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			to encourage continued agricultural production; monitoring changes in groundwater levels during construction; monitoring seepage effects; relocating or replacing agricultural infrastructure in support of continued agricultural activities; identifying, evaluating, developing, and implementing feasible phased actions to reduce EC levels; engaging counties, owners/operators, and other stakeholders in developing optional agricultural stewardship approaches; and/or preserving agricultural land through off-site easements or other agricultural land conservation interests.
255	2	<p>The north intakes are set for [9,000] CFS [cubic feet per second] and existing intakes at Clifton Court are licensed for [15,000] CFS. What is the maximum amount of water allowed to be taken? What determines the north/south pumping allocation?</p> <p>If the 9,000 CFS is taken from the north, what will keep the river from still trying to flow backwards as it does now when pumping from the south?</p>	<p>The North Delta intakes would have a capacity to divert 9,000 cfs. The SWP and CVP South Delta intake capacity is 15,000 cfs. The total amount of exports is defined by the combined capacity of 15,000 cfs of the SWP Banks Pumping Plant plus the CVP Jones Pumping Plant which would convey all water diverted at the North Delta and South Delta intakes, as described in Chapter 5 and Appendix 5A of the EIR/S. The allocation pattern between the North Delta and South Delta intakes is dependent upon the operational rules for each action alternative, No Action Alternative, and Existing Conditions, as described in Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives. These operational rules include the North Delta Bypass Flow criteria developed to maintain Sacramento River flows toward San Francisco Bay. As shown in Figures Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Model Results, of the EIR/EIS, the north Delta intake tunnels would not be fully utilized except for a few months in wet years.</p>
256	1	<p>Stop the tunnels. [They will cost] too much money [with] no benefit to most of the taxpayers of California.</p>	<p>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) and Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding, respectively).</p>
257	1	<p>We are so disturbed by the lack of necessity of this "Project", we formally object.</p> <p>Additionally, this "Project" has yet to be defined sufficiently to even understand.</p> <p>Is this "Project" a tunnel or a canal or a combination? These are two or three entirely different "Projects". While we fail to see the necessity for either we also fail to see the public interest in either alternative.</p> <p>Before you can address the list of actual project issues, you need a clearly defined "Project".</p>	<p>The proposed project is described in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS in Section 4.1.2. For information on the purpose and need for the proposed project, please refer to the 2013 DEIR/EIS Chapter 2 and the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS Section 1.1.3. The lead agencies believe that 2013 Draft EIR/EIS and 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS are complete in their evaluation of impacts (using the best available science), direct and cumulative, that project description is complete and satisfies the requirements of NEPA, and that the project objectives are also precise and complete and satisfy the requirements of CEQA.</p>
257	2	<p>Does the fact the State can't afford either project make a difference? If the State is counting on private or semi-private funding then they have no right to proceed with eminent domain. Please require honest disclosure as to what is taking place. Will we find out later that DWR personal [sic] had vested interest or undisclosed conflicts?</p> <p>What DWR is doing is an alarming waste of taxpayers' money in the current economic climate. They are interviewing to hire a project manager before we even have the project defined and approved.</p> <p>Existing contract water rights will place this matter in the court system for years, costing millions and yet the public last spoke in denial of a Canal.</p>	<p>The construction of the water delivery facilities is estimated to cost \$14.9 billion, an amount that would be paid for by the state and federal water contractors who rely on Delta exports. The range of costs for water vary widely among contractors south of the Delta. Costs depend on the source of water, transport facilities, energy requirements, among other factors. For the agricultural customers of the CVP, prices range from \$100 per acre-foot to more than \$400 per acre-foot. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, which buys water from the SWP, estimates that the cost of the proposed project would translate into about \$5.00 extra per household, per month in its service area. The final cost of water from the new conveyance facilities would be determined by numerous factors. A number of these significant factors, such as the project yield and allocation of costs, have yet to be determined. Please see Master Response 5 for information regarding funding of the proposed project.</p>
257	3	<p>No bonding company will insure the tunnel alternative because of the size and scope of such a project has never been done.</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.</p>
257	4	<p>Please take this letter as a formal objection to the scientific claims that a Delta levy failure is going to happen. More review and specifics are needed.</p>	<p>The lead agencies acknowledge your disposition towards Delta levee failure risks. Please see Section 6A.5 of Appendix 6A, FEIR/EIS, for more information on potential risks to the Delta from climate change, sea level rise, and seismic events.</p>
257	5	<p>Do not rush to improperly approve these potential projects. A more likely occurrence is that tunnel drilling could set off an earthquake or open a fissure that causes irreparable</p>	<p>Please refer to the potential hazard of vibration-induced seismic activity during project construction is</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>environmental harm. Has that potential been considered?</p> <p>As a practical example, on one of the Delta Island's [sic], a new owner filled a ditch line and replaced the line in a location seemingly more direct and helpful for his farming operation. Unfortunately nature had too long gone a different way. The new line and filled old line resulted in farming disaster, as neither functioned. The farmer was forced to install pumping systems and add several additional ditches.</p> <p>Don't be so sure that these untested designs can even work, or will work as designed, especially when there is little water to supply the existing system.</p>	<p>discussed in impact GEO-5 in Chapter 9.</p> <p>Modern tunnel boring machine technology has allowed for successful completion of nearby tunnel projects such as the Bay Tunnel underneath San Francisco Bay in a high seismic area.</p> <p>Regarding the part of the comment pertaining to impacts caused by altering ditches, the relationship of altering ditches to tunneling-induced seismicity is unclear.</p>
257	6	<p>The impact to the existing operating farming Delta system has not been properly considered. The added trucks and power and sewage disposal needs exceed the capacity tenfold and no project should be considered until minimum considerations like sewer connections and drinkable water exist in the fragile ecosystems of these small Delta towns. Hood for example is a main area impacted and yet the town does not have one public restroom and the town hasn't been connected to the regional sewage treatment plant just 6 miles away. The lack of understanding of the practical scope of 80 trucks and 80 truck drivers, starting and stopping in Hood daily for 6 to 10 years of ongoing construction shows the lack of planning for this project.</p>	<p>The impacts on agricultural resources and public utilities in the Delta during construction of the conveyance facilities are presented in Chapters 14 and 20, respectively</p>
257	7	<p>Please deny this application by the California DWR.</p> <p>The basis for the denial is the following unaddressed significant adverse cumulative impacts and effects:</p> <p>The applicant has failed to demonstrate or provide reliable science that the barriers will significantly prevent salt water intrusion into the Delta. Examining figure 1 on page A-4, the untrained eye can see that even if the barriers did slow some salt water intrusion, they are essentially sacrificing everything southwest of the barriers to save those properties to the north. This decision was not identified or discussed, nor is this a proper use of public funds. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that installing the barriers will not further cause Clean Water Act violations.</p>	<p>This comment appears to be on the temporary barriers action, not the BDCP/California WaterFix EIR/EIS. Not response is necessary.</p>
257	8	<p>Please deny this application by the California DWR.</p> <p>The basis for the denial is the following unaddressed significant adverse cumulative impacts and effects:</p> <p>The barriers will immediately affect water quality, not just on the surface of the sloughs, but will have adverse hydrological effects on Sutter Island itself. The applicant's barriers will create stagnant sloughs on 75% of the navigable waterways surrounding Sutter Island. This is unprecedented and unexplored science, with the realistic potential for long lasting, unavoidable and irreparable damages to Sutter Island. In addition, the potential damages to the subsurface water table have not been analyzed nor has the effect on the levees been determined.</p>	<p>The California WaterFix proposes one operable barrier at the head of Old River near the confluence with the San Joaquin River. No barriers on Sutter Slough or near Sutter Island are proposed under this alternative. Potential effects on groundwater is presented in Chapter 7 of this Final EIR/EIS. Potential Effects on levees is discussed in Chapter 9, Geology and Seismicity. Please also refer to RDEIR/SDEIS Appendix 3, Supplemental information for USACE permitting requirements (Appendix 1F in this Final EIR/EIS) and Appendix 6A, BDCP/California WaterFix Coordination with Flood Management Requirements.</p>
257	9	<p>Please deny this application by the California DWR.</p> <p>The basis for the denial is the following unaddressed significant adverse cumulative impacts and effects:</p>	<p>In Section 5 of the RDEIR/SDEIS, it clearly denotes that each cumulative effect is analyzed in Section 4 and that Section 5 includes the revisions. "...each resource chapter contains an analysis of the cumulative effects specific to that resource that could potentially result from implementation of any of the proposed alternatives and other cumulative projects. To ensure that the cumulative analysis accurately captures whether a proposed project's incremental effects are cumulatively considerable, the revised analysis of</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>The applicant failed to analyze the cumulative effects of erecting these barriers on the environment, including traffic on land and water, as well as the negative impact on the native fish as well as endangered fish species.</p>	<p>cumulative impacts adopts a clear two-step process, as endorsed by CEQA case law. (1) The cumulative analysis first determines if the effects of the proposed project, in combination with those of other past, present, and probable future projects, would be cumulatively significant—that is, if a significant cumulative impact exists. (2) If the answer is yes, the analysis then determines whether the proposed project’s incremental effect is cumulatively considerable and thus significant in and of itself.</p> <p>This section breaks this analysis into two separate pieces which build upon each other. First, Section 5.2.1 examines concurrent project effects, considering potential additive effects of project components that are constructed during the same time period. Then, Section 5.2.2 describes the revisions to the cumulative analysis under each resource topic and the effects of these revisions on the cumulative impact analysis when considered in concert with the effects of the project effects described in Section 5.2.1. References have been made to specific sections of the chapter that have been revised. Analyses of the cumulative impacts for Alternatives 4A, 2D, and 5A are included in 31 their entirety under each resource section below.”</p> <p>As seen in this discussion, cumulative effects of all of the topical issues have been extensively addressed. See also Master Response 9 regarding cumulative effects.</p>
257	10	<p>Please deny this application by the California DWR.</p> <p>The basis for the denial is the following unaddressed significant adverse cumulative impacts and effects:</p> <p>The applicant foundation for going forward is that because they did this once before in 1977 on one slough, they can use that data to support closing two sloughs that surround one Island (Sutter Island). Even for a non-scientist, this evaluation seems fatally flawed. The foreseeable damages of silt build up and the damage potential by cutting off water flow without any definite public benefit, makes this 40 million dollars project one you should deny approval/permitting.</p>	<p>The commenter does not offer any evidence on how the project would result in significant siltation impacts. The EIR/S had an extensive discussion of the potential effects of siltation including the soils section discussing the effects associated with construction, surface water, effects to navigation, etc. See also Master Response 9 regarding cumulative effects.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the Clean Water Act as well as federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
257	11	<p>Please deny this application by the California DWR.</p> <p>The basis for the denial is the following unaddressed significant adverse cumulative impacts and effects:</p> <p>Looking specifically at the project, the applicant did not consider the cumulative effect of construction of the barriers will have on the communities of Hood and Courtland. The identified rock storage in the town of Hood is a small parcel without access for semi-truck turn around. Trucks must also ingress or egress directly onto State Highway 160 at a near 90 degree turns without visibility [sic]. In addition, the traffic, noise, and air pollution effect has not been evaluated. The town of Hood has no sewer system or public restrooms and has only one unopened restaurant. The town of Courtland has a public sewer system, but no public restrooms and only one part-time restaurant. Neither town has a traffic signal light, but merely 4 or 5 stop signs in the entire town. As the landowner adjacent to the Hood rock storage parcel, we do not agree to have a nuisance of rock piles, dirt, dust, and traffic, affecting our adjacent property. We have spent thousands of dollars improving our parcels, including approval by the Sacramento County General plan and Zoning Code to allow wine and beer making and wine and beer tasting. These are not compatible uses with rock storage and removal. In addition the State of California has a Water Testing Facility on this small rock storage parcel that would be compromised by any barge loading or unloading or any pollution into the water.</p>	<p>Because construction of this alternative would primarily occur in rural parts of the Plan Area, and is not likely to occur in areas with municipal water service, it is not expected to impact municipal water systems. If there are no existing water lines in the vicinity, then field offices will require construction of a water tank. Water for construction will be provided by available sources to the extent possible; if needed, water may be brought to the construction sites in water trucks. Additionally, the potable water demand would be temporary and limited to the construction period. Wastewater services for construction crews would be provided by temporary portable facilities and is not anticipated to have any impact on the community of Hood as wastewater would be taken offsite to a treatment facility. Public restrooms in Courtland would not be significantly impacted as temporary portable facilities would be provided for construction crews.</p> <p>Rock storage and removal is not anticipated to impact private property of the commenter.</p> <p>Traffic impacts in the communities of Hood and Courtland are analyzed in Chapter 19, Transportation. Specifically, segments CT 25, CT 26, and SC 02 cover Hood and segment CT 27 covers Courtland. The lead agencies are committed to addressing impacts of construction traffic on local road conditions. Mitigation Measure TRANS-1b specifies limiting construction activity to hours with more capacity to avoid operational deficiencies on affected roadways.</p> <p>The construction management plans described in Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a will include coordination with Sacramento County. The lead agencies will also ensure development of site-specific construction management plans (TMPs) that address the specific steps to be taken before and during construction to</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>minimize traffic impacts and consideration of impacts on intersections and driveways.</p> <p>Air quality in the plan area, including air quality impacts from construction is analyzed in Chapter 22, Air Quality. Noise impacts in the plan area, including impacts from construction, is analyzed in Chapter 23, Noise and Vibration.</p>
257	12	<p>Please deny this application by the California DWR.</p> <p>The basis for the denial is the following unaddressed significant adverse cumulative impacts and effects:</p> <p>The applicant has failed to analyze project alternatives, including not building the barriers and instead educating the public on strict water conservation. Lawns and parks are still being watered in Sacramento and throughout the Valley. Despite these uses, the State seeks to potentially permanently destroy a 2,500 acre Delta Island to possibly slow some salt water intrusion. In addition the circumstances by which this project was initially designed have changed. The initial emergency basis for this barrier project no longer exists. Some significant rain fall has occurred and the reservoirs and snow pack suggest that with careful management and no pumping water to Southern California, the danger of salt water infusion can be avoided.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed.</p> <p>Although conservation components and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the BDCP or California WaterFix. It is important to note that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, water recycling, etc.</p> <p>For more information regarding demand management please see Master Response 6.</p>
258	1	<p>I saw and heard nothing that explains how stealing the water and routing it around the Delta saves it. There is a limited supply--known fact. Water is needed to flow through normal channels to support the wildlife and the economic interests in the Delta--known fact. Removing water eliminates the natural selection of the Delta. This is a water theft. More storage is needed. The current drought shows that there is no excess water. How can water be taken and removed from its natural course and no damage will be done [sic]. This is exactly the same as Owens Valley and Mono Lake. California and the current political powers are ignoring the obvious. There is no excess water to distribute. The environmental and economic damages will be severe. Putting lipstick on this pig doesn't make it any better. This is a poorly conceived idea with severe consequences.</p>	<p>For more information regarding water storage please see Master Response 37.</p> <p>Under the stringent environmental statutes in place today, including the Endangered Species Act, operation of the proposed water delivery system could not drain the Delta rivers and channels dry, including the Sacramento River. The proposed project's facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants, would be operated in accordance with permits issued by, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the State Water Resources Control Board, among other agencies. The proposed project would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards.</p>
259	1	<p>This project is smoke and mirrors--very sad our government would spend our tax dollars--we need reservoirs and water storage in the entire state. This can be done without destroying our environment.</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Future reservoir projects are still undergoing evaluation or review, including potential surface water reservoir projects and groundwater storage projects. Therefore, potential storage projects are only considered in the EIR/S as cumulative impact projects (please see Master Response 37). It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. 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>
261	1	<p>Request to extend the comment period for the Bay Delta Conservation Plan/WaterFix Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report and Revised Draft Environmental Impact Statement</p>	<p>The comment period for the RDEIR/SDEIS was extended by 60 days to October 30, 2015. Please see Master Response 39 for more information about the public review period. In order to facilitate a more easy review of the changes in the RDEIS/SDEIS compared to the Draft EIR/EIS, a version of the document was made</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>The Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP)/WaterFix Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report and Revised Draft Environmental Impact Statement (RDEIR/RDEIS) was released July 9, 2015. Prior to the release representatives of the California Natural Resources Agency represented to the Delta Counties Coalition that they would have more than forty-five days to respond to the document. While it is true that fifty-three days is longer than forty-five, it is also true that fifty-three days is an insufficient amount of time to thoughtfully review and analyze the changes, contrast the differences with the original plan, and craft thoughtful responses intended to further the lead agencies' analysis of the project.</p> <p>The California Environmental Quality Act and the National Environmental Policy Act are grounded in fully disclosing the impacts of projects so that we as a society can make informed decisions -- knowing full well the consequences to our communities, our livelihoods, and our environment of those actions. Given the importance of the project, and the complexity of the document, the 53-day public comment period is woefully inadequate.</p> <p>San Joaquin County is one of the communities most affected by the WaterFix, and we believe more time is needed to thoroughly review and comment on the project. San Joaquin County respectfully requests that the public comment period for the BDCP/WaterFix RDEIR/RDEIS be extended by a minimum of 120 additional days beyond the current 53-day comment period. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Mike Selling, Public Works Director at (209) 468-3100, or me at (209) 468-3113.</p>	<p>available that included hyperlinks and track changes, in addition to a Section 508-compliant version.</p>
262	1	<p>If one of the purposes of the dual tunnels and Water Fix proposals is to reduce water loss to leakage and evaporation, then wouldn't it be far cheaper and more effective to line ditches and then cover them (and aqueducts) with solar panels? Doing so would not only allow the state to leave more water in rivers and streams for wildlife and recreation, but would also generate some of the power needed [to] desalinate ocean water along the coast.</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need. 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. . The alternatives included in the EIR/EIS represent a legally adequate reasonable range of alternatives and the scope of the analysis of alternatives fully complies with both CEQA and NEPA.</p>
264	1	<p>All of us in the East Bay are with Jim Frazier. Why not think of other solutions? Surely there are incentives the state could use to support local municipalities and develop a cistern system similar to Sun Valley in Los Angeles county? Why not? Probably would save the state dollars compared to tunnels and city's could help finance. Have less of a negative impact environmentally on the Bay area and be better received from the entire state.</p> <p>Make an adjustment. Do not hold your current line because you are too far into it; too many people are against what you are doing and other solutions need to be considered. Reconsider/rethink!</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the range of alternatives selected.</p> <p>The alternatives included in the Draft EIR/EIS represent a legally adequate reasonable range of alternatives and the scope of the analysis of alternatives fully complies with both CEQA and NEPA. The Lead Agencies carefully considered all potential alternatives that were proposed during the scoping process and during time of preparation of the Draft EIR/EIS. In response to public input, several new alternatives have been studied in the Recirculated DEIR/EIS and a new preferred Alternative (4A) identified.</p> <p>The specific proposals that were considered but ultimately rejected by the Lead Agencies are discussed in Appendix 3A of the DEIR/EIS, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1. Appendix 3A thoroughly explains why various proposals were not analyzed in the EIR/EIS.</p>
264	2	<p>ATT 1: California Is Sitting On The Solution To Its Drought Problem</p> <p>There's a lot of water around, it just needs to be put to better use.</p> <p>Written By Terry Tamminen</p> <p><a href="http://www.fastcoexist.com/3044988/california-is-sitting-on-the-solution-to-its-drought-problem?utm_source=facebook">http://www.fastcoexist.com/3044988/california-is-sitting-on-the-solution-to-its-drought-problem?utm_source=facebook</a></p>	<p>The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in the comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.</p>
265	1	<p>This proposal is insane. Do really have to have this so Gov Brown can have this lunatic</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
		<p>legacy?</p> <p>This is a disaster in the making!</p>	
266	1	<p>I will support the "Water Fix" if you dump the "Train to no-where"!</p> <p>Are you all a bunch of morons?</p> <p>Oops, that an oxymoron!</p>	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS..
267	1	<p>Three Valleys Municipal Water District operates a wholesale water treatment plant that receives 100% of its imported water supply from the State Water Project system. As such, resolution of the decades-long water resource issues in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta is of the highest priority for our retail member agencies and over half-million residents in the eastern portion of the San Gabriel Valley. Three Valleys Municipal Water District has been an outspoken supporter of the original Bay Delta Conservation Plan (BDCP) since its inception and we remain steadfast in our endorsement of this effort.</p>	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
275	1	<p>[ATT 1: Binational Agreement due soon on Tijuana River pollution. By Sandra Dibble, San Diego Union-Tribune, July 12, 2015]</p>	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in the comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
275	2	<p>[ATT 2: San Diego seeks new water recycling approach. By David Garrick, San Diego Union-Tribune, July 12, 2015]</p>	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in the comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
275	3	<p>[ATT 3: Why are San Diego water agencies being hit with big mandatory cuts? By George Skelton, San Diego Union-Tribune, July 12, 2015]</p>	The comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in the comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
276	1	<p>If your plan does include burrowing owls, could you please take a moment and fill out the information for your jurisdiction in the shared Google Drive Spreadsheet (see link below). We would like to address the following questions:</p> <p>How long was (or has been so far) the development phase for the plan (column F)?</p> <p>Has your plan been approved by wildlife agencies, if yes, when? If not, when is approval anticipated (column G)?</p> <p>How long is the permit term (column H)?</p> <p>What is the total plan area (column I); the target for protected/managed areas for burrowing owls (column J); and the area currently under protection/management for burrowing owls (column K)?</p> <p>How much of the total protected/managed area for burrowing owls will be on public land (column L)?</p> <p>How many breeding seasons has the burrowing owl population (i.e. census of the total number of pairs and their young) in the plan area been monitored (column M), and what is the monitoring frequency specified in your plan (e.g., annually, biennial; column N)?</p> <p>How many pairs of burrowing owls were present within the plan area during the most</p>	<p>This comment is a general request to provide information on how burrowing owls are being addressed in the BDCP/California WaterFix, which would be shared at the October 2015 California Burrowing Owl Consortium. No issues were raised to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>current breeding population census (please include the year; column O)?</p> <p>What is the target population for your plan area (number of breeding pairs; column P)?</p> <p>Can you please provide a table and/or graph representing population trends (yes/no; column Q)?</p> <p>Are adaptive management processes in effect to meet the plan's targets (yes/no; column R)?</p> <p>If your Conservation Plan is still in the planning phase, please provide goal dates/numbers if available, or enter N/A.</p> <p>We will share the compiled information publicly during the California Burrowing Owl Consortium Conference at San Jose State University on October 24. More information about this conference is available on our website:  <a href="http://burrowingowlpreservation.org/html/consortium_2015.htm">http://burrowingowlpreservation.org/html/consortium_2015.htm</a></p>	
277	1	<p>I propose that all municipals develop their own storm drain water capture programs to boost water supplies .The design should be so simple enough to carry out. All we need to do is to cap all the main storm drain outpours that flow into creeks, rivers, estuaries, bays, oceans, etc. and pump the precious storm drain water to storage facilities that can be tanks, manmade reservoirs, aquifers, etc. for consumption. Of course, we need to treat the storm drain water before consumption. If anyone argues that the storm drain water is too dirty and unfit for our consumption, then I can answer back that it is unfit for discharge into any body of water, anyway! So, we already had manmade watershed with endless pavement of streets and highways as well as extensive concrete coverings all over the municipals in California which rainwater is so beautifully funneled down the street grates into mazes of pipes that keep joining into those huge main drainpipes that flows out by millions of acre-feet every year, even drought ones.</p> <p>I ask you what [expletive] we are doing wasting them! I ask you! Yeah, I ask you!</p>	<p>Although the development of improved water storage and water use efficiencies at the local and regional level is beyond the scope and control of the BDCP or California WaterFix, the DEIR/EIS nonetheless recognizes and discusses these issues. Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, in the EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including storm water drainage. While these elements are not proposed as part of the BDCP or the California WaterFix, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. Please also see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 7 regarding desalination, and Master Response 6 regarding demand management.</p>
278	1	<p>We strongly oppose the latest version of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan. The plan will not provide any additional water.</p>	<p>The issues raised by the commenters address the merits of the project and do not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/EIS documentation. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
278	2	<p>We strongly oppose the latest version of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan. Delta water quality will decline.</p>	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.</p>
278	3	<p>We strongly oppose the latest version of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan. The benefits all seem to flow to Southern California and large agricultural interests, to the detriment of the Bay Area: this is not a balanced plan.</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. 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. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water), and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply).</p>
278	4	<p>We strongly oppose the latest version of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan. The expense is huge (\$60 million) and the benefits nonexistent.</p>	<p>DWR acknowledges your opposition to the project. The project would cost approximately \$15 billion to build (not \$60 billion). Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on the costs of project implementation.</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
278	5	We strongly oppose the latest version of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan. All of the habitat restoration proposals have been eliminated.	<p>Please note that the BDCP is no longer the preferred alternative. The preferred alternative is now Alternative 4A and no longer includes an HCP. Alternative 4A has been developed in response to public and agency input. The EIR/EIS analyzes all alternatives, including Alternative 4A.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 5 for additional detail on the BDCP and the alternatives involving an HCP component.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
278	6	We strongly oppose the latest version of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan. The plan fails to meet federal standards under the Clean Water Act and Endangered Species Act.	<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 Clean Water Act as well as federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
278	7	We strongly oppose the latest version of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan. The plan does not outline the costs for water users.	Please see Master Response 5 regarding costs of the project.
278	8	We strongly oppose the latest version of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan. The plan does not provide any drought relief.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
278	9	We strongly oppose the latest version of the Bay Delta Conservation Plan. The plan does not address water conservation or recycling, which would actually be of value.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures).</p> <p>The California Water Action Plan recognizes that all Californians have a stake in the future of our state's water resources, and that a series of actions are needed to comprehensively address the water issues before us. The five-year agenda spells out a suite of actions in California to improve the reliability and resiliency of water resources and to restore habitat and species -- all amid the uncertainty of drought and climate change. For more information regarding future developments of the California Action Water Plan please follow <a href="http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf">http://resources.ca.gov/docs/Final_Water_Action_Plan_Press_Release_1-27-14.pdf</a>. Future committees for the Proposed Project implementation may provide future opportunities for innovative input as well. The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: <a href="http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/">http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/</a>.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 6 regarding demand management.</p>
280	1	<p>Please do not destroy the Delta habitat. Please consider future generations' financial stability do not place California residents in billions of dollars' worth of debt.</p> <p>There are solutions that would benefit everyone in this drought that do not require building tunnels in northern California.</p> <p>We have wildlife protected lands. These areas would be affected. There is farm land along</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>the Sacramento/Delta water way. Fresh water is needed in order to sustain these farms.</p> <p>Please consider there are other proposals that should be primarily exhausted before running tunnels all the way to southern California.</p> <p>Financial responsibility for billions of dollars is an enslavement of the people. I ask for you to protect us and our environment.</p>	<p>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 with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
281	1	<p>I'm Katherine Miller, chair of the San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors, and I'm here today on behalf of our residents who live and work in the San Joaquin Delta and the people who will be most directly impacted by the outcome of this process; the people of California and the generations to follow who will have to pay for this massive boondoggle, farmers who have held title to Delta land for generations, the port workers and fishermen whose livelihoods depend on the protection of the Delta, and all of those who come to visit, recreate, and enjoy the estuary and the precious wildlife whose numbers are dwindling.</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project and Master Response 5 regarding costs and implementation. For more information regarding the Delta as a place, please see Master Response 24.</p>
281	2	<p>From day one, the San Joaquin Board of Supervisors expressed the need for a statewide solution that does not sacrifice the Delta or pit the North against the South.</p> <p>We warned that the BDCP was the wrong solution, but we were denied a place at the table so that our voice could be heard.</p> <p>I'm here today to let you know that we remain committed to ensuring that this process does not go wayward again.</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 with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 45 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <p>More than two-thirds of the residents of the state and more than two million acres of highly productive farm land receive water exported from the Delta watershed. The proposed project aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. However, the project proponents have no authority to designate what water is used for.</p> <p>One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board.</p> <p>The Lead Agencies have no power to impose penalties on individual water users. DWR and Reclamation have contracts with various entities, some of which sell water to water retailers, who have individual policies and programs to motivate ratepayers to conserve water. Different districts have the right to take different approaches depending on their individual circumstances.</p> <p>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
281	3	<p>Rebranding the BDCP as the California WaterFix fails to fix its central fallacy; that a massive tunnel system, which would greatly reduce the natural flow of water through the Delta, can meet the Delta Reform Act's co-equal goals.</p> <p>Our concerns in regards to the newly issued EIR/EIS focus on four key areas; Delta protection, governance, cost, and timing.</p>	<p>Please see the response to comment 281-2. Please also see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <p>For more information regarding the proposed project's compliance with the Delta Reform Act please see Master Response 31.</p>
281	4	<p>We need to protect and improve water quality and water quantity in the Delta region for fish, wildlife, and Delta farmers and residents.</p>	<p>Please see the response to comment 281-2. Please also see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
281	5	<p>The San Joaquin Board of Supervisors need our voice to be included on all governance decisions that affect our region. We're still wondering why we weren't invited to participate the first time around. We support the holistic and inclusive approach of Prop 1 that was approved by California voters.</p> <p>BDCP/California WaterFix's top-down model must go.</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. See Master Response 5 for more details regarding governance.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
281	6	<p>We must ensure that the cost is worth the effort.</p> <p>While the original BDCP price tag have 17 billion has been cut to 15, we remain concerned about the potential for cost overruns, which could push the final cost to over \$50 million dollars, putting taxpayers at risk again with a plan that creates no new water.</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on the costs of project implementation.</p>
281	7	<p>With the issuance of the latest iteration of this plan and the revised draft EIR/EIS, the fact that we were only given approximately 50 days, now extended to 60, is disconcerting. It's more important that we get it right this time instead of rushing.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 39 for more information about the public review period.</p>
282	1	<p>I've lived in around the Delta all my life, currently on Smith Canal in Stockton. I'm an active outdoorsman. I fish, hunt. I've already seen the decline in striped bass, salmon, water quality, and the ecosystem degraded.</p> <p>I'm old enough to remember this starting with Edmund G. (Pat) Brown with the California Aqueduct, Central Valley Water Project, Delta-Mendota Canal. There's already been increased pumping.</p> <p>If the tunnels are built, that will kill what's left of the Delta. It cannot take the bypass of freshwater. It's not worth it to send water south to benefit a few corporate wealthy individuals growing almonds on arid desert land for export.</p>	<p>The proposed project may impact recreational opportunities including impacts on hunting, fishing, swimming, and boating. Mitigation is proposed to reduce these impacts; however some impacts may remain significant due to the long-term nature of the temporary construction related impacts. Please see Chapter 15, Recreation, and Section 4.3.11 for more detail on the impacts of the proposed project on recreational opportunities and the proposed mitigation.</p> <p>To compensate for the loss of access as a result of constructing the river intakes, the proponents will work with the California Department of Parks and Recreation to help insure the elements of the proposed project would not conflict with the elements proposed in DPR's Recreation Proposal for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and Suisun Marsh (California Department of Parks and Recreation 2011d) that would enhance bicycle and foot access to the Delta. This would include the helping to fund or construct elements of the American Discovery Trail and the potential conversion of the abandoned Southern Pacific Railroad rail line that formerly connected Sacramento to Walnut Grove.</p>
282	2	<p>I plead with whoever is in charge to hear the public testimony and not allow this boondoggle to go through. The people do not want it. Just like the people do not want the train to nowhere, the people do not want these tunnels.</p>	<p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p>
283	1	<p>It seems like we have our priorities wrong. Even before the tunnels, even before the drought, we were hurting the fish populations. Now we are almost at the point of extinction for several species, and we continue to take more water. And for what? So a very few giant agricultural businesses can send almonds to China.</p> <p>Short-term financial gain for a few at the expense for the rest of us and the environment is wrong. Conservation is good. We should have started years ago. But now if everybody saves</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 reduction in</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>what the governor has asked, it's still less than we used for just one crop. And they keep planting more.</p> <p>We have to get our priorities straight. Short-term gains for a few don't justify the damage we are doing. Follow the law and save the fish.</p>	<p>total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal and State regulating agencies, ESA compliance, and project design. Over the long-term, 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 exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries to SWP and CVP water users in drier periods.</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>
284	1	How can you take water from above the Delta out of the Delta without degrading the habitat and the fisheries, the salmon?	<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 reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can divert from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal and State regulating agencies, ESA compliance, and project design. 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. Over the long-term, 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 exports in the wet winter months when the river flows are high.</p> <p>The initial operational criteria included in Alternative 4A are based on the best available science and vary by hydrologic conditions, water year type, fish presence and/or month, and designed to minimize effects on fish while meeting water supply objectives. The change in point of diversion reduces entrainment of all fish substantially, and the NDD would be screened and operated to minimize entrainment and impingement. Other details of the effects on fish are described in Chapter 11. None of the impacts of Alternative 4A are concluded to be significant after mitigation.</p>
284	2	How can the state justify damaging the Delta to provide water for the southern San Joaquin when the quality of the ground -- excuse me, when the soil quality is in some places toxic and of low quality?	State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via proposed conveyance facilities.
285	1	I have been a boater, water skier, and fisherman on the California Delta all my life. If we were to build the Delta tunnels, it would totally change that life. And not only would it change recreation, but more importantly it would change our fishing industry, it would crash our fishing industry. It would -- because we would have no salmon. Therefore, the commercial salmon fishing would not be able to happen. Nor would sport fishing happen.	For information about effects of the preferred alternative, Alternative 4A, on salmonids and the commercial salmon industry, please see Chapter 11, Fish and Aquatic Resources, which indicates that effects would not be adverse.
285	2	Building the Delta tunnels does not create any more water, it just moves the water around. Instead desalinization, which means you're moving the salt from the water from a saltwater	For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		body and converting it to freshwater would make more jobs because they would have to have people working in the desalinization plants, plus it would actually create more freshwater.	
285	3	The saltwater that could come into the Delta by building the tunnels would be unfarmable for the Delta farmers who have been here for many years compared to almond farmers in the central valley.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
285	4	What I do not understand is that they say they're only going to take the same amount of water with the tunnels. Why are they building such a big tunnel? It just seems that if they're going to build such a big tunnel, they would take more water anyhow.	<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 shown in Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Model Results, of the EIR/EIS, the north Delta intake tunnels would not be fully utilized except for periods of time when the Sacramento River flows are higher than in drought years. 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.</p> <p>The project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities, including operations to protect water quality, can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see <a href="http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml">http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml</a>) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see <a href="http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html">http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html</a>).</p>
286	1	How much freshwater will we have flowing through the Delta after completion of this project? My understanding is that we have very severely impacted this ecosystem of the Delta and the bay downstream of that because we divert so much freshwater out of the Delta. I don't see that--adding additional ways to take freshwater out of the system it seems to me can only make things worse, so I would really like to see some guarantees that we will maintain adequate freshwater flows, adequate to preserve that environment and the wildlife communities that depend on that environment.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Over the long-term, 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. The water would be stored at locations south of the Delta during the high flow periods to allow reductions in deliveries in drier periods.</p> <p>The project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities, including operations to protect water quality, can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see <a href="http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml">http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml</a>) and</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see <a href="http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html">http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html</a>).</p> <p>The EIR/S modeling results for the No Action Alternative indicate that, with or without the project, rising sea levels will bring saline tidal water further into the Delta than occurs at present.</p>
287	1	<p>I believe that the twin tunnels are going to remove too much water from our Delta system, which is going to cause sediment to build up in the estuaries and end up contaminating all of our farmlands and destroying our fish.</p> <p>I used to do salmon restoration, and I personally have seen the detriment of the fish with lack of water flows. It is extremely difficult to try to restore habitat once it has been destroyed, and I think scientists need to do a significant study on the effects before they follow through with this project.</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>
288	1	<p>The intent of the tunnels will not make a single drop of water for the state. It will not provide any water for the state. It's simply a grab from the south to pay off the government's cronies.</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. 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]).</p> <p>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. Please also refer to Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports/Area of Origin/Water Rights), Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), and Master Response 35 (MWD Water Supply).</p>
288	2	<p>There are many alternatives, such as putting dams and expediting the construction of such dams--expedite the procedure just like they did for the Kings arena when they need something done.</p>	<p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, and Master Response 37 regarding why an alternative focused on creating additional storage, either in the Delta or elsewhere, was not included in the BDCP/California WaterFix or FEIR/EIS.</p>
288	3	<p>There's also other means; desalination, which works well for the Arab countries, and also osmosis, recycling water.</p>	<p>For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.</p>
288	4	<p>Do not destroy the Delta. Do not under any circumstances build any tunnel and destroy the Delta. That is a crime to society and the government is forcing its will on the people which did not vote for such a project. It will destroy their way of life.</p>	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts; as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p>
289	1	<p>I would like to comment about the CEQA, process that is going on here. At a local and county level this would not be considered a significant outreach to the public. Which is required under CEQA when you have a project that will impact the environment. And this is a very superficial and slick effort at public outreach with minimal outreach to the public, very little data, very little specificity.</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>As state agencies, the Department of Water Resources and the California Natural Resources Agencies have an obligation to provide the public with educational information that is rooted in fact, based on reasonable</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>assumptions supported by facts and expert opinions substantiated by facts. Doing so for a project of large scale and complexity can be a challenge. The BDCP website, blog, Your Questions Answered, and social media platforms have been the primary vehicle for communicating important project information and correcting misinformation. Brochures, factsheets, webinars and videos are other tools the State has employed to educate the public about the proposed BDCP and the EIR/EIS process. Representatives from the State have also held numerous meetings and briefings around the state to educate stakeholders and provide them with critical information about project developments and the EIR/EIS process. Brochures, factsheets, webinars, reports and other information is kept on the project website, <a href="http://www.BayDeltaConservationPlan.com">www.BayDeltaConservationPlan.com</a> and is available for review. Historical materials remain available for review and are labeled as achieved or superseded. For more information on the public outreach efforts made during the BDCP and EIR/EIS process, please see Chapter 32 of the EIR/EIS and Master Response 40. For additional information about how this project has been developed in an open and transparent manner, please refer to Master Response 41.</p>
289	2	<p>There is nothing here that is pertaining to the animals, the fish, the wildlife that would be impacted by this project.</p>	<p>The lead agencies disagree that the EIR/EIS contains no information on the fish and wildlife that would be affected by the project. Chapter 11 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect fish. Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect wildlife species. Both chapters describe the impacts, both negative and positive, and discuss measures that would be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts and to compensate for significant impacts.</p>
289	3	<p>There is nothing really that talks about the economic benefits to the taxpayers of California. We know about the benefits to the billionaires in Southern California who will benefit from this project, but where is the benefit to the rest of the population of California? We are going to be on the hook for many, many years for the project and in the form of bonds and interest on the bonds. And it's my understanding that only 5.5 jobs will be created for every million dollars spent, which is a very poor return on our taxpayer investment.</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on the costs of project implementation.</p>
290	1	<p>I just wanted to make a comment about how a tunnel -- or, excuse me, taking water from an estuary has never been a benefit to the estuary itself. So we cannot say that we have co-equal goals to send water south from the estuary and allow for the preservation of the estuary.</p> <p>At this point, we have taken more water or promised more water than actually flows through the estuary, the Delta. And the Delta needs a rest. It needs to have us stop taking more and more water. This high-tech piping system keeps the water from ever actually entering the Delta, so none of the benefit of the water will accrue to the Delta. All of this is being sent south for the benefit mostly of farmers in the south San Joaquin. This will in the long run create a green south San Joaquin -- south San Joaquin Valley and the browning of the Delta area.</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 project facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants would be operated in accordance with permits issued by the State Water Resources Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The project only would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. More information on the ranges of project water diversions, based on water year types and specific flow criteria, can be found in Chapter 3, Section 3.6.4.2, North Delta and South Delta Water Conveyance Operational Criteria, EIR/EIS. Current limitations and operational criteria for existing facilities, including operations to protect water quality, can be found in DWR's State Water Resources Control Board Permit D1641 (see <a href="http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml">http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml</a>) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see <a href="http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html">http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html</a>).</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to improve Delta habitat and SWP/CVP water supply reliability. Through the development of specific operational criteria, some of the actions in the 2008 U.S. Fish and Wildlife and 2009 National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinion reasonable and prudent alternatives would be superseded with the proposed project operational criteria, as described in Chapter 3, Description of Alternatives, in the EIR/S. Although the proposed project does not involve an HCP component, the lead agencies maintain that the proposed project would continue to meet the co-equal goals of a reliable water</p>

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			supply and a restored Delta ecosystem to benefit all water users.
290	2	It will be expensive to the farmers in the Delta. Who will pay for these is a question that can only be answered over time. The rhetoric says the rate payers will pay for it. However, we are all rate payers, so therefore not only are we in the Delta paying for it through the loss of our jobs and our economy but also through the actual monetary outlay eventually coming into our lives as taxpayers.	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 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. Please see Master Response 5 regarding funding of the proposed project.
291	1	The rivers and streams of northern California have public trust value. The public trust is an affirmation of the duty of the State of California to protect the heritage of the streams, lakes, and highlands of California. The twin tunnel project does not fairly balance the water rights of northern California, stretching from the Bay Delta to the Oregon border, against those of the Central Valley and Los Angeles.	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.
292	1	The Delta is in ecological collapse due to the lack of freshwater flow, per the American Academy of Scientists and other scientists studying the problem.  Won't the tunnels deprive the Delta of its freshwater flows needed to bring it back to health?  What studies have been done on the increased salinity in the Delta to its aquifers and wells which serve the Delta community?	Chapter 8, Water Quality, of the 2013 DEIR/EIS, 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS, and FEIR/EIS discloses the potential water quality impacts resulting from constructing and operating CM-1. 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.
292	2	Why is the area of origin being sacrificed along with its entire economy to benefit others?	Please refer to master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project. For more information regarding changes in delta exports, area of origin, and water rights please see Master Response 26.
292	3	Have state of the art fish screens even been designed and tested?	If the commenter is referring to fish screens at other locations, then the answer is yes: for example, at the site of the former Red Bluff Diversion Dam and the Freeport Regional Water Authority Intake.
292	4	What are the benefits to the Delta counties and the over 4 million people that live and work and rely on clean Delta water?  The Delta does not have and has not met Clean Water Act standards. The water has to be so clean. And it hasn't met those standards in three years, but I'm supposed to drink it.  How will the tunnels improve water quality when the water will be taken before it even reaches 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.
293	1	The proposed twin tunnels will have the capacity to take in 100 percent of the average flow of the Sacramento River, leaving Delta waterways in lower Sacramento and San Francisco Bay with no regular flow of clean freshwater. The environmental results are the collapse of the Sacramento, San Joaquin, San Francisco ecosystem and elimination of salmon and most other native fish species, reduction of endangered bird populations, periodic toxicity of shellfish, massive fish kills in San Francisco Bay, weeds and stagnant water along shorelines, and disruption of the offshore ocean ecology.	By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria with the goal of improving water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to establish a more natural east-west flow for migratory fish, improve habitat conditions, and allow for greater operational flexibility. The proposed project does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented 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.  Under the stringent environmental statutes in place today, including the Endangered Species Act, operation of the proposed water delivery system could not drain the Delta rivers and channels dry, including the Sacramento River. The proposed project's facilities, including water intakes and pumping plants, would be

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			operated in accordance with permits issued by, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the State Water Resources Control Board, among other agencies. The proposed project would be permitted to operate with regulatory protections, including river water levels and flow, which would be determined based upon how much water is actually available in the system, the presence of threatened fish species, and water quality standards. Refer to Master Response 28 (Operational Criteria) and Chapter 3.4.1.2 of the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS.
293	2	Predictable economic outcomes include strong negative effects on San Francisco's tourist and convention industries, a loss of appeal for the Bay Area as a site for new business locations, a reduction of property values in cities and communities near impacted waterways, and an end to farming, sport fishing, and seasonal work in the Delta, Stockton, and adjacent areas of the Sacramento Valley.	<p>Please refer to Impact ECON-13, 4, 5 and 6 under Alternative 4A, the preferred alternative, in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics. As discussed under Impact ECON-1, construction of the water conveyance facilities would be anticipated to result in a net temporary increase of income and employment in the Delta region. Construction-related employment from the project is estimated to peak at 2,427 FTE jobs in year 3. Total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) would peak in year 12, at 8,673 FTE jobs. Direct agricultural employment would be reduced by an estimated 16 FTE jobs, while total employment (direct, indirect, and induced) associated with agricultural employment would fall by 57 FTE jobs. Throughout the five-county Delta region, population and employment would expand as a result of the construction of water conveyance facilities, as discussed under Impacts ECON-1 and ECON-2. Under Alternative 4A, additional regional employment and income could create net positive effects on the character of Delta communities.</p> <p>San Francisco is not within the proposed project footprint; therefore, no socioeconomic effects are expected to San Francisco or the Bay area. Additionally, the Delta encompasses a large area. While fishing would be reduced at select locations during construction, it would not be reduced in the Delta as a whole. Please refer to Impact REC-4 under Alternative 4A in Chapter 15, Recreation. With implementation of mitigation measures, the project would result in a less-than-significant impact on recreational fishing opportunities.</p>
293	3	My question to the agency heads is why did the BDCF not include any information on likely environmental effects of the tunnels project on San Francisco Bay or likely economic effects of the tunnels project on the Bay Area? Does the California WaterFix document remedy this critical oversight?	<p>Impacts on Delta outflows (fresh water flowing to the Bay) are not significant. Model simulation results for the proposed project alternative (4A) indicate that long-term average and wet year peak outflows would increase in winter months with a corresponding decrease in spring months because of the shift in system inflows caused by climate change and increased Delta exports as compared to Existing Conditions. In other year types, Alternative 4A would result in higher or similar outflow because of the spring outflow requirements. In summer and fall months, Alternative 4A would result in similar or higher outflow because of changes in export patterns and OMR flow requirements and export reductions in fall months, and also because of the Fall X2 requirements in wet and above normal years. The incremental changes in Delta outflow between Alternative 4A and Existing Conditions would be a function of both the facility and operations assumptions (including north Delta intakes capacity of 9,000 cfs, less negative OMR flow requirements, enhanced spring outflow and/or Fall X2 requirements) and the reduction in water supply availability due to increased north of Delta urban demands, sea level rise and climate change. Results for the range of changes in Delta Outflow under Alternative 4A are presented in more detail in Appendix 5A, Modeling Technical Appendix, of the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS. For a more detailed response regarding impacts beneficial uses of water, please see Master Response 34.</p> <p>Socioeconomic impacts are evaluated in the 2013 Draft EIR/EIS Chapter 16 and in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS Section 4. Per NEPA requirements, socioeconomic impacts are evaluated for the five counties that make up the study area (the area in which impacts may occur) which is comprised of Sacramento, San Joaquin, Yolo, Solano and Contra Costa Counties.</p>
293	4	What makes you believe that the time between the release of the California WaterFix document and the time of these two hearings gives residents sufficient time to read, research, consider, and respond thoughtfully to what you propose?	Please see Master Response 39 for more information about the public review period.
294	1	How can the state consider a project of this magnitude without voter approval?	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
294	2	How can they put the needs of the Metropolitan Water District ahead of the water needs of one of the most fertile agricultural areas in the world?	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The SWP and CVP operations under the action alternatives would only deliver water under existing water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board to DWR and Reclamation for use by the SWP and CVP, including Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.
294	3	Why would we consider destroying the unique ecological features of the greatest estuary in the western states to give water to the idiots who chose to plant orchards on the arid lands of the west side of the lower San Joaquin Valley? Plant annual crops that can lay fallow during drought years.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The SWP and CVP operations under the action alternatives would only deliver water under existing water rights issued by the State Water Resources Control Board to DWR and Reclamation for use by the SWP and CVP. 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.
294	4	I consider the state government to have been criminally negligent in ignoring the inevitable water crisis that has been building since the failure to build the Auburn Dam.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Future reservoir projects are still undergoing evaluation or review, including potential surface water reservoir projects and groundwater storage projects. Therefore, potential storage projects are only considered in the EIR/S as cumulative impact projects (please see Master Response 37). It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in agricultural and municipal/industrial water conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures Appendix 1B, Water Storage, EIR/EIS, describes the potential for additional water storage and Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. While these elements are not proposed as part of the proposed project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources.
294	5	It's unbelievable that we continue over-pumping of the water table with no efforts to recharge it in wet years. Now Moonbeam wants to rake the entire central valley, destroy agriculture, fisheries, and ecological and recreational opportunities just to reap venues on the state for denying his father's Peripheral Canal, and to reward his southern supporters.	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.
295	1	I'm a long-term resident of the San Joaquin County.  I'm here for a resounding no to the twin tunnels, Delta tunnels, California WaterFix, or whatever name will be given to mislead the public because the fix does not fix. It will have a devastating impact on our five counties, Sacramento, and the San Joaquin Delta region, with lasting environmental damage to Delta ecosystem.  There will be severe economic downturn to a multi-billion-dollar farming and tourism industry, taking away a treasured way of life for farmers, families, and businesses.	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. Please see chapter 15 for a discussion on impacts to recreation. Impacts to agriculture are identified and discussed in Chapter 14; project proponents have proposed measures that would support and protect agricultural production in the Delta by securing agricultural easements and/or by seeking opportunities to protect and enhance agriculture with a focus on maintaining economic activity on agricultural lands. Please see Master Response 18 for more information on agricultural mitigation.
295	2	Spending billions of dollars will not create any new needed water.  Simply using the antiquated fix to move water from the north to the south is not the answer to California's water problems.	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. 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. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
295	3	Here is what California should be doing. Californians pride themselves for being on the edge of technology and innovation. So let's use these innovations and technology for a comprehensive water plan with bold innovative solutions using new technologies which will produce more water and manage the state's water supply such as desalinization, capturing, recycling, creating new efficiencies for industry, commercial, and residential applications.	<p>The proposed project is one component, among many, of the California Water Action Plan. The California Water Plan evaluates different combinations of regional and statewide resources management strategies to reduce water demand, increase water supply, reduce flood risk, improve water quality, and enhance environmental and resource stewardship. Follow the California Water Plan here: <a href="http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/">http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/</a>.</p> <p>By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns while securing reliable water deliveries. Appendix 1C of the Final EIR/EIS, Demand Management Measures, describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply including desalination. Refer to Master Response 6 for more information on demand management. Although components such as desalination plants and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the State, they are beyond the scope of the project. Refer also to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 7 (Desalination).</p>
295	4	We need to save our Delta and let our Delta farmers continue to contribute to California's largest economy, which is farming.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>Impacts to agriculture are identified and discussed in Chapter 14; Lead Agencies have proposed measures that would support and protect agricultural production in the Delta by securing agricultural easements and/or by seeking opportunities to protect and enhance agriculture with a focus on maintaining economic activity on agricultural lands. Please see Master Response 18 for more information on agricultural mitigation.</p>
296	1	I would like to know what the appropriate agencies are going to do to mitigate all the heavy equipment, big trucks, tractors, and tunneling equipment to protect the levees from the damage from all this equipment going back and forth for ten plus years.	Please see Section 6A.3.2 in Appendix 6A, FEIR/EIS, for potential impacts to levee integrity as a result of increased construction traffic.
296	2	I'd like to know what steps are being taken to protect the wildlife and fish from the digging of the tunnels and depositing of the materials, displacing animals and plants and fish during the time these tunnels are being built.	Chapter 11 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect fish. Chapter 12 of the Final EIR/EIS addresses the potential for project alternatives to affect plant and wildlife species. Both chapters describe the impacts, both negative and positive, and discuss measures that would be implemented to avoid and minimize impacts and to compensate for significant impacts, including the impacts from digging the tunnels and storing the reusable tunnel material.
297	1	I am against the twin tunnels.  I don't believe the twin tunnels will fix California's water dilemma. I believe the twin tunnels will ruin our agriculture, our economy, and our environment. The tunnels are not a fix for the California water program. Sorry, not "program." "Problem."	<p>More than two-thirds of the residents of the state and more than two million acres of highly productive farm land receive water exported from the Delta watershed. The proposed project aims to provide a more reliable water supply, in a way more protective of fish. However, the project proponents have no authority to designate what water is used for.</p> <p>One of the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) charges is to ensure that the State's water is put to the best possible use and that this use is in the best interest of the California public. This charge is reflected in part by the designation of beneficial uses established through the State Water Board's planning process. These beneficial uses are identified in each Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) issued by the State Water Board.</p> <p>The proposed project Lead Agencies have no power to impose penalties on individual water users. DWR and Reclamation have contracts with various entities, some of which sell water to water retailers, who have individual policies and programs to motivate ratepayers to conserve water. Different districts have the right to take different approaches depending on their individual circumstances.</p>
297	2	I'd like to ask the members of our state assembly, assemblymen, senators, governor, if they've considered other alternative methods such as greywater reclamation and, since we're going into an El Niño weather pattern, whether we have considered other water	Although components such as desalination plants and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. It is important to note that the proposed project is

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		reclamation devices at a more local level for businesses and homes in order to address this drought situation.	not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage.  Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management.
298	1	<p>I'm a beekeeper and an orchardist, so I'm very interested in what's happening with this water issue.</p> <p>Well, a couple of things that I'm thinking about is carbon soil sequestration and how -- how we should -- we're going through this huge drought. And we haven't even begun the drought by NOAA. NOAA said we're going into a drought that is going to turn everything west of the Rocky Mountains from Idaho down to northern Mexico into a desert, except for a thin strip along the coast that gets the ocean humidity.</p> <p>So is it really wise to be spending on six million cubic yards of concrete for freshwater, to make these concrete tubes and divert water that might not even be there when the project is done?</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.
298	2	My idea is what they need to do is concentrate agriculturally on a high quality, high humus soil in an area where there is hydration and there is water, like the Delta, and then let -- those areas are probably marginally profitable for agricultural because they have this water. And use carbon soil sequestration to help the soil recover and build top soil so that at end of the drought we have -- which is we're looking at 30 plus years -- we will have additional fertile soil. Because we have to have cover crops and things that can grow on a minimal amount of water.	State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via proposed conveyance facilities.
299	1	<p>The twin tunnels are projected to be completed in 2030, so this water fix won't be accomplished for another 15 years. And what major public works project was ever completed on time or on budget?</p> <p>To date, a complete cost-benefit analysis of the project has not been published by the state. Stakeholders don't know if it is a workable sustainable project that will be able to be afforded in 15 years when it is completed, yet they must sign on to it now so that it can move forward. Is this a sensible business decision?</p> <p>If the twin tunnels project does go forward and stakeholders find they cannot afford it, will the California taxpayer be required to bankroll the billions of dollars in construction costs and subsidize the price of water that stakeholders will receive from the Delta?</p>	Please refer to Master Response 5 for additional details on the costs of project implementation.
299	2	In 2014 the UC Davis study concluded that the Sacramento and San Joaquin River system is over-allocated by five times the amount of water that flows through the area in an average year. There is not sufficient water to meet contracted needs that the State Water Resources Control Board has approved. And the new tunnel project will be incapable of taking even more.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. Water rights issued on rivers in the Trinity and Central Valley watersheds include a wide range of beneficial uses from hydropower to municipal, industrial, and agricultural water users. However, not all of the water diverted under the water rights is consumptively used. For example, water diverted for hydropower electric generation is fully returned to the water bodies; and a portion of the water diverted from municipal, industrial, and agricultural water uses is returned to the water bodies. In addition, the amount of water diverted is dependent upon water rights priorities and the need to meet environmental flow and quality requirements. Therefore, it is difficult to compare the total volume of water rights licenses to the total amount of water available in the system. For example, water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation are not fully available to provide water under the SWP and CVP water contracts in many years due to the demands

RECIRC Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>of senior water rights holders and regulatory requirements.</p> <p>The action alternatives would only export water allocated to the SWP and CVP under existing water rights, as limited by hydrologic conditions and regulatory requirements issued by the State and federal agencies.</p>
299	3	<p>The Governor has admitted that the tunnels do not produce any new water. Therefore, a year like 2015 would require that the tunnels remain empty. This is not what I call an effective project. The tunnels do not make economic sense. Dump the tunnels and get realistic.</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. Deliveries to in-Delta senior water rights users are the same under the Existing Conditions, No Action Alternative, and all action alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS in accordance with 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.</p> <p>The total amount of water exported by month in each water year type for each action alternative is presented in Appendix 5A, Section C, CALSIM II and DSM2 Model Results, of the EIR/EIS. As shown in Appendix 5A, Section C, the north Delta intake tunnels would not be fully utilized except for a few months in wet years. However, it is important to have 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 north Delta intakes would have minimal flows that would be required for maintenance of the pumps during critical dry years.</p>