

RECIRCltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
2200	1	Build more reservoirs to help survive droughts.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project 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 Master Response 37 (Storage) for additional information.</p>
2201	1	These short-term fixes ignore the role healthy ecosystems play to sustainable human activities. It's important not to undermine the health of the Sacramento Delta.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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. The project would help to address the resilience and adaptability of the Delta to climate change through water delivery facilities combined with a range of operational flexibility. In addition to the added water management flexibility created by new water diversions and operational scenarios, the project would improve habitat, increase food supplies and reduce the effects of other stressors on the Delta ecosystem.</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>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 6 (Demand Management) for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 4 (Alternatives), Master Response 31 (Delta Reform Act), and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
2202	1	Anything Jerry Brown wants is totally opposite of what the state needs. He is a proven total destroyer of this state.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds</p>

RECIRCLtr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
2203	1	You only have to look at the Florida Everglades to know this is bad!	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
2204	1	California rejected this Delta-destroying type of plan years ago, and it is still a rotten idea. Southern California needs to stop using more water than they can environmentally sustain. Massive projects to transport water hundreds of miles are absurd.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
2205	1	The plan to divert the Sacramento River to resolve California's water problems has a strong potential to negatively impact the ecology and physical structure of the Delta. As proposed please do not proceed with this plan.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
2206	1	We're not willing to sacrifice the Delta so that these special interests can continue to control water policy.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
2207	1	[The California WaterFix] puts the greed of frackers and Big Agriculture before the rights and needs of the people of California.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised. State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows. Fracking - or "hydraulic fracturing"-- presumably could be an "industrial" use of water, and is a lawful use of water. Pursuant to Senate Bill 4 from 2013 (Stats. 2013, Ch.313), moreover, the state Department of Conservation, through its Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR), is currently working on fracking regulations. Please see Master Response 34 for additional information regarding use of water

RECIRCLtr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			delivered by proposed water conveyance facilities.
2207	2	<p>Read Vandana Shiva on small-scale farming, embrace the Transition movement and start moving to a smarter water policy where environmental quality counts, family farms are the order of the day, produce is grown that is either suitable for our arid climate or in greenhouses where the water can be efficiently recycled, and the use of pesticides kept to a minimum.</p> <p>And taxpayer dollars are not sucked up to bolster short-term profits for unsustainable corporations.</p> <p>Small farms are the wave of the future. Already, using between 20% and 25% of the world's farmland, they are feeding the entire world: http://www.permaculture.co.uk/news/0406145066/small-farmers-are-feeding-world-le-ss-land</p>	<p>The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of a particular water supply augmentation approach (greater agricultural conservation) and does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the proposed project. For more information please refer to the updated draft 2013 California Water Plan's strategy for agricultural water use efficiency, which describes the use and application of scientific processes to control agricultural water delivery and use. Also, refer to Master Response 6 and Appendix 1C for further information on demand management measures, including increasing agricultural water use efficiency and conservation.</p> <p>For more information regarding agricultural beneficial water use please see Master Response 34.</p>
2207	3	<p>The tunnels project will be a disaster on many levels. Don't waste tax dollars, don't impose unfair costs on the citizens of Los Angeles.</p> <p>This project will cost billions of taxpayer dollars at a time when our state cannot afford it. An entire river should not be redirected for the sake of large-scale greed by unsustainable farming methods and into the cesspool of chemical runoff from fracking.</p>	<p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>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>
2208	1	Do not mess with the natural flows of the Delta.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
2208	2	Your plan for the tunnels does not ask citizens and farmers to make better use of their own water first.	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 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.
2209	1	Do not cater to the corrupt capitalists that want to make a bundle off this.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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>

RECIRCLtr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.
2210	1	I have driven down to the areas in the Delta where the tunnels are planned to go. The amount of water that will be leaving this habitat -- for wildlife and humans -- will leave a wasteland.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p>
2211	1	I understand that we are facing a crisis in our usage of fresh water but we cannot forsake our wildlife and their habitat because of our unwillingness to face the truth: we need to do a much better job at conserving water.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of a particular water supply augmentation approach (greater conservation) and 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>
2212	1	Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to increase water conservation and independence and reduce the dependence on the Delta diversions. It should also thoroughly evaluate future impacts under a range of climate change scenarios with reduced snowpack and altered precipitation patterns.	<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>One of the fundamental purposes of the Proposed Project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP and CVP system in the Delta to provide water supplies of the SWP and CVP for users located south of the Delta and Delta water quality consistent with statutory and contractual obligations of the SWP and CVP, as described in Section 2.3 of Chapter 2, Project Objectives and Purpose and Need, of the EIR/EIS. The EIR/EIS assumes that the projected water demands in the No Action Alternative and all of the EIR/EIS alternatives include the assumptions that water conservation will be implemented by 2060 in accordance with State law. However, it is recognized that the Proposed Project will not provide adequate water supplies to meet the SWP and CVP contract amounts in most circumstances. The project is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta. 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, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other</p>

RECIRCLtr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management). It is assumed that the State and local agencies will invest in future water supplies to replace reduced surface water and groundwater supplies and to meet future growth, as described in Chapter 30, Growth Inducement and Other Indirect Effects.</p> <p>During the preparation of the EIR/EIS, a sensitivity analysis was completed, as presented in Appendix 5A, Section D.3, Climate Change Modeling, to simulate conditions under the No Action Alternative and Alternative 1 under the five climate change scenarios based upon 112 climate change projections (see Appendix 5A, Section A). The operations results from these simulations were analyzed to understand the range of uncertainty in the incremental changes that would occur with a range of climate change scenarios. The sensitivity analysis indicated that Alternative 1 results would change with climate change scenarios; however, the incremental differences between the No Action Alternative under a specific climate change scenario and Alternative 1 under the same specific climate change scenario were consistent. Because the EIR/EIS only evaluates the incremental differences, and not absolute values, between the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative and the action alternatives, the incremental changes appear to be similar under a range of climate change scenarios.</p>
2212	2	I understand that there are some benefits to a diversion with tunnel transport on the Sacramento River upstream of the Delta. However, the only way I could support such a project would be if the tunnels were sized to limit the diversion rate far below the tunnel/canal size that is currently proposed, and if the project provided a clear, unambiguous net benefit for the Delta ecosystem and the species it supports. To help ensure that diversions and exports are not increased in the future, tunnel size must be reduced to the size of diversion evaluated in the EIS, biological opinions, and other evaluations.	<p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>The Lead Agencies will make the final decisions regarding the selection of an alternative (and therefore, an operational scenario) for the purposes of CEQA and NEPA. USFWS and NMFS have authority under the federal Endangered Species Act to determine whether the Proposed Project meets the regulatory standard of ESA Section 7, and CDFW, a CEQA responsible agency, has authority to determine if the Proposed Project meets the regulatory standards of CESA. Please see Chapter 3 of the FEIR/EIS for additional information on Proposed Project operations.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 28 and 5 for more information regarding operational scenarios and compliance with ESA respectively.</p>
2213	1	The focus needs to be on local alternatives throughout the state that reflect long-term adaptation to climate change.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of one particular water supply augmentation approach (local solutions only) and does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 4 regarding the range of alternatives selected and Master Response 3 for information on the purpose and need for the proposed project. 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.</p>
2214	1	This "Fix" will not create any new water, but it will destroy the habitat of the Delta, which contains many species found only in California. Please stop the California WaterFix, and review more alternatives that will actually	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds</p>

RECIRCLtr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		protect the Delta while helping other local water needs.	to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.
2215	1	If the tunnels are built, at tremendous cost, will there be any water to ship? Right now, the snowpack is almost gone.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
2216	1	Deport 11 million illegal aliens and there would be more water per citizen!	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.
2217	1	If [the California WaterFix] continues, I will be forced to bring this topic forward to the University of California Regents, faculty, and student bodies.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
2218	1	Stop robbing Peter to pay Paul and bite the damn bullet. California needs to have a permanent water conservation program, not new ways to waste water from Northern California to water driveways and sidewalks. Stop kicking the can down the road and creating an ever greater environmental problem, not just for wildlife but voting California residents too. Stop fracking, a horrible waste of our precious drinking water. Stop wasteful, overhead watering practices; stop growing food in the desert. You know, common sense. Put the money and effort in to improving existing infrastructure and ensure clean water for future generations.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives. Regarding water use, the proposed project does not make determinations regarding how water delivered through the proposed project conveyance or other water conveyance facility will be put to a beneficial use. The State Water Resources Control Board is charged with the comprehensive planning and allocation of water resources in California. One of the State Water Resources Control 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. Please refer to Master Response 34 for additional details on beneficial use.
2219	1	The Tunnels plan is a 15-plus billion-dollar disaster waiting to happen. Having water bypass the Delta will take needed flows away from fish, birds, and other wildlife. The	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

RECIRCLtr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		loss of the largest estuary on the West Coast of North America is not worth a pair of new tunnels.	<p>Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
2220	1	This project will not "fix" anything; it will just take more water away from farmers in Northern and Central California and send it to Southern California to build more houses.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water) and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply)</p>
2221	1	The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta and take needed flows away from fish, birds, and other wildlife. The loss of the largest estuary on the West Coast of North America is not worth a pair of new tunnels.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
2222	1	Any program that diminishes the flow of water through the Delta and [does not] protect and preserve the environment of the Delta as a healthy, sustaining ecosystem is unacceptable. In particular any intrusion of saltwater into the Delta must be avoided, even if it means stopping export of water to the south.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p>
2222	2	It is likely that we are entering a long-term drought combined with higher temperatures. This combination means that the money for the tunnels would be better spent	The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of one particular water supply augmentation approach (conservation) and does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS.

RECIRCLtr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		developing and implementing conservation technologies to use water more effectively.	Please see Master Response 4 regarding the range of alternatives selected. 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.
2223	1	<p>This estuary is the most important on the West Coast. The rivers feeding it can be restored to the immense salmon production they once accomplished [and] the wetlands they once constituted will return with the rising ocean levels, supporting the vast diversity of species they did only 150 years ago. This part is fact, no matter what schemes are created to benefit unsustainable cotton or other agriculture.</p> <p>California has grown to its limits, and can sustain no more industry, no more excess population, no more "development," but needs to restore and retain our natural systems -- for human health, psychological health, the health of our productive ecosystems, and the health of the planet.</p> <p>Because the continuing taking of water from the wetter forests and ecosystems has already seriously damaged their integrity -- their value -- in producing the good air, pollution reduction, resiliency in preventing loss of the necessary plants and animals we depend upon against fisheries loss, disease of all kinds including communicable, against the deterioration of the huge Bay Area into a slough which would no longer be renewed with yearly nutrient recharge, I guarantee that this industry attempt at creating a poisonous third-world pollution situation will be the greatest mistake ever made by legislators and administrators of this state.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>As noted in Section 2.5.1 of the RDEIR/SDEIS, the Delta has been subject to substantial human disturbance over the years.</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 Clean Water Act federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental.</p>
2223	2	What we need is to cease taking Northern California water for overdevelopment, and return the native ecosystems of migratory fish, birds, and the vein of riparian health that allows for groundwater retention, and plant health -- including the normal regimes of fire. Your DEIR/DEIS is flawed because it does not take into account ways to reduce the dependence on the Delta by increasing water independence locally. California has shown that reducing water use can make a difference. We have incredibly wasteful urban practices, along with some inappropriate agricultural products. We cannot allow further use of long-distance transport of water, impoverishing everywhere from which it is drained/taken.	<p>The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of a particular water supply augmentation approach (greater conservation).</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>
2224	1	I believe that there are better ways to spend that outrageous amount of money (like fighting homelessness) than to divert water, and is not going to get us more water to begin with. It's about time government officials get serious about protecting our very decimated environment. Stop the nonsense already!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>

RECIRCLtr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
2225	1	The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta, will not provide needed water, will spur further urban growth in Southern California, and will cost the Democrats to lose credibility with the electorate statewide.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p>
2226	1	All of California is experiencing severe drought. To divert water from the Delta to flow to other areas of the state is unwise as operators of the tunnel will pressure the State Water Resources Control Board to maximize exports which will do further harm to the Delta, as they have done during this drought.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p>
2226	2	This project is not a water fix but a water disaster for the Delta and our local economy. It will cost between \$15 [and] \$50 billion to build these tunnels. Since these tunnels will not increase the water supply, but will certainly increase the profits of some corporate being, the cost of building the tunnels and the loss of the productivity of farm lands as the tunnels are being built is an utter waste of money.	Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding the purpose and need for the project, and to Master Response 5 regarding costs of implementation. When required, DWR would provide compensation to property owners for economic losses due to implementation of the alternative. For more information regarding impacts to agriculture and socioeconomics and its associated mitigation measures please see Chapter 14 and 16 of the FEIR/EIS.
2226	3	Conservation, better and wiser use of our groundwater and recycling projects leading to regional self-sufficiency would be less costly and [more] sustainable.	Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.
2227	1	The Tunnels is not a fix. It is a water grab that will decimate wildlife habitat and take life giving water away from the biggest estuary on the west coast.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p>

RECIRCLtr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
2227	2	Governor Brown is completely misguided and wrong on this issue.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
2228	1	This twin tunnel project will destroy the Delta. It is already under stress from drought -- [the] last thing it needs is less water.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Since the late 1800s, the Bay-Delta ecosystem has been substantially altered. Changes in key environmental attributes of the Bay-Delta have contributed to the current degraded state of the ecosystem and appear to be proximate causes of declines in desired fishes and increases in non-native species. California WaterFix is not intended to address all the factors that have contributed to the Delta's decline and briefly summarizes a few but not all of those factors. Many factors that have contributed to the decline of the Delta's ecosystem including the conversion of tidal marsh and floodplains to farmland, construction of levees and altering of tide flows, in-Delta and upstream water diversions, contaminant discharges, ammonia and nutrient discharges and changes to the food web, increases in water temperatures, and introduction of non-native and invasive species. The Delta will remain in a highly altered state for the foreseeable future and the project is not intended to address all the past harms or restore the Delta to a pre-altered state.</p> <p>The project would help to address the resilience and adaptability of the Delta to climate change through water delivery facilities combined with a range of operational flexibility. In addition to the added water management flexibility created by new water diversions and operational scenarios, the project would improve habitat, increase food supplies and reduce the effects of other stressors on the Delta ecosystem.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
2229	1	You cannot abandon all habitat conservation and expect the environment to carry on as needed.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The project would also include habitat restoration to reduce effects on the water conveyance facility on listed species and has reduced many of the Delta footprint impacts, compared to other alternatives addressed in the EIR/EIS by constructing tunnels versus canals, rerouting the alignment to affect less private property and reduce effects on Staten Island to reduce effects on greater sandhill crane. In addition, the State is also implementing the California Delta EcoRestore program to restore up to 30,000 acres of Delta habitat.</p>
2229	2	The old "robbing Peter to pay Paul" way of thinking has never worked. Changing the flow of water in one area to benefit another creates only changed imbalance.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more

RECIRCLtr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.
2230	1	What you call "water fix" doesn't fix anything. It's only designed so water mismanagement can continue. This has to change.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <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 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>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. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
2230	2	Instead of increasing this water grab, politicians should focus on sustainability. Stop urban expansions and golf courses in desert areas. Install water meters in areas where there are none. Fix the leaks in the water distribution system. Build more reservoirs. Reverse the ongoing expansion of acreage used for water-gobbling export crops like rice, alfalfa and almonds. Have the guts to totally reform the archaic water rights legislation. If the above measures are taken, the Delta can be saved.	Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 34 for additional details on the determination of beneficial use.
2231	1	The fifteen billion dollars a be better spent putting water recycling facilities in place and be much better for the state in the short and long run. The tunnels are only a stopgap measure that will do more harm than good. We need permanent solutions.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The proposed project is just one element of the state's long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. Although conservation components and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>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. For more information regarding purpose and need please see Master</p>

RECIRCLtr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			Response 3.
2232	1	This tunnel plan is much more ludicrous an idea than the peripheral canal was back in the 80's.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Master Response 36 explains how the California WaterFix Project is different from the previously proposed Peripheral Canal. The Natural Resources Agency and DWR staff will continue seeking improvements and refinements to the current proposal in order to enhance species benefits and to avoid, reduce or mitigate for negative impacts to people, communities, sensitive species and habitats.</p>
2233	1	Now is simply not the time to sacrifice the health of our environment or our water system for secondary concerns. With global climate change already occurring, the health and sustainability of our environment, particularly our water system, must be paramount.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS were raised.</p>
2234	1	People who live on the Delta are against the tunnels, that will afford an ugly view, and the disruption of wildlife who live near and on the Delta. There are way to many alternatives to enacting something new, when our watersheds can be enlarged and fixed! Take care of what we have first	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the Clean Water Act federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental.</p> <p>See Chapter 17 (Aesthetics and Visual Resources) for information on impacts to visual resources and mitigation for these impacts. Refer to Master Response 4 regarding alternatives to the proposed project.</p>
2235	1	The San Francisco Bay/Delta has been already been severely damaged by shipments of water to Southern California. It is a waste to taxpayer dollars and it creates far more problems for Delta. Jerry Brown should be ashamed of himself for promoting this travesty.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S.</p>
2236	1	<p>We've seen what happens to important wetland habitats when water is siphoned away from them: just look at Mono Lake. Los Angeles took all of the water from its input rivers and the lake has almost completely disappeared. Obviously the Delta won't disappear, since what fresh water you remove will be replaced by salt water from the Bay/ocean, but this will completely change the ecosystem of the Delta.</p> <p>Another point is that the San Francisco Bay Area is already taking water from the Delta, which is already putting a strain on the resources of this fragile ecosystem.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights which were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. Senior water rights holders are not affected by implementation of</p>

RECIRCLtr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>action alternatives. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation can pump from the new north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the Proposed Project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the project and the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/EIS.</p>
2236	2	<p>The money would be better spent building water storage devices in Southern California to capture the increased rain that they seem to be getting instead of taking water from Northern California when this part of the state is in a severe drought.</p> <p>An additional water-saving measure might be buying out the cotton farms, and other non-food producing farms, which use so much more water than the average crop. They could move to other areas in the U.S. where water is plentiful.</p> <p>But robbing Peter to pay Paul is not good water management.</p>	<p>It is important to note, as an initial matter, that the proposed project is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California's water problems and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage. Nor is the proposed project intended to solve all environmental challenges facing the Delta. Please see Master Response 6 (Demand Management) for further information regarding how many of the suggested components have merit from a state-wide water policy standpoint, and some are being implemented or considered independently throughout the state, but are beyond the scope of the proposed project.</p> <p>Rather, the scope and purpose of the proposed project is much more limited. As explained in Chapter 2 Project Objectives and Purpose and Need of the Final EIR/EIS, the fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the State Water Project (SWP) system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and Central Valley Project (CVP) south-of-Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework with statutory and contractual obligations.</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 Master Response 37 (Storage) for additional information.</p> <p>The plan does not increase the amount of water to which DWR holds water rights or for use as allowed under its contracts. Although the project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. It is projected that water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented California Waterfix project would be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Please see Master Response 26 (Changes in Delta Exports) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) for further information.</p> <p>Lastly, providing regulatory oversight to agribusinesses is outside the scope of the proposed project and environmental analysis. The Lead Agencies do not have land use planning authorities (such as changing local land uses and zoning ordinances or controlling what crops should be planted).</p>
2237	1	<p>The California WaterFix will lead to the destruction of the Delta ecosystem and add no new water to California. That same money, used to build desalination plants up and down the California coast and especially in the Los Angeles, San Diego, Santa Barbara and San Francisco Bay areas, would create new water sources that are not drought-affected and leave the Sacramento River waters free to flow and existing water taps, now going to the coastal cities, available for the central California towns and farms. We don't need to build more pipes moving around the same water. We need new water sources that desalination plants will provide.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 7.</p>

RECIRCLtr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
2238	1	This is not about bereft birders and recreational fishing. Estuaries are a fundamental part of the environment and key to clean water, nurseries for economically important fishes, and buffers against storm surges. It's all connected, you know.	<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>Estuaries and species associated with them are discussed in Chapter 4.3.7 of the EIR/S. 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 Clean Water Act federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental.</p>
2239	1	We voted against this twice. Why is Governor Brown going around what the public voted on and rejected? Who knows where the rain will fall in the future? Right now it looks like Southern California is getting more rain than Northern California. The Delta is already under a lot of stress, the aquifer is pumped out. Leave it alone. I feel very very strongly about this.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
2240	1	Any review must account for the increasingly inescapable fact that the water is being diverted to an area that never should have been allowed to develop as it has precisely because of its historically limited water supply.	<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>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 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>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. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
2241	1	We cannot just continue to waste our water on things like fracking which uses billions of gallons of our fresh water and turns it forever toxic. Why have we not banned fracking until the end of the drought and that is just for starters!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water, and state laws require that water pumped from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. Beneficial uses include agricultural, municipal, and industrial consumptive uses; power production; and in-stream uses including fish protection flows. Fracking - or "hydraulic fracturing" -- presumably could be an "industrial" use of water, and is a lawful use of water. Pursuant to Senate Bill 4 from 2013 (Stats. 2013, Ch.313), moreover, the state Department of</p>

RECIRCLtr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>Conservation, through its Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR), is currently working on fracking regulations. Please see Master Response 34 for additional information regarding use of water delivered by proposed water conveyance facilities.</p> <p>The BDCP/California WaterFix 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 BDCP/California WaterFix is not intended to serve as a state-wide solution to all of California’s water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures). The proposed project would not increase the amount of water to which SWP and CVP hold water rights for use allowed under their contracts and permits and approvals for refuge water supplies or other environmental purposes.</p> <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 commenter does not offer any evidence on how the project would result in significant water quality impacts related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.</p>
2241	2	We must also find more ways to capture rain water that comes down instead of just letting it flow right out into the ocean! Cut the water supplies of water wasters and fine them stiffly. Encourage homeowners to use rain barrels to capture water for their outdoor watering needs. We really can do a better job of conserving our water. We do not need to steal every drop away from fish, birds and other wildlife. Do not destroy our largest estuary on the West Coast! We must do this right the first time!	<p>The proposed project is just one element of the state’s long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. Although conservation components and demand management measures have merit from a statewide water policy standpoint, and are being implemented or considered independently through the state, they are beyond the scope of the proposed project. The California WaterFix is not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies, and the recovery and conservation of threatened and endangered species that depend on the Delta.</p> <p>Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management, 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.</p>
2242	1	The ongoing drought-stressed land can not support any more digging because of the increased draining of the dwindling ground water. Digging 2 tunnels will further destabilize the ground and threaten the increase of land. This will cause the increase in buckling roads, bridges, buildings and damage to infrastructures in our state. Such instability can cause damage to businesses and farmland.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The 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.</p>
2243	1	As someone raised in Northern California near a number of important marsh areas, perhaps I care more about the impact on those locations and animal and plant species than you do. Perhaps it isn’t personal enough to you. Or perhaps you have not had a chance to evaluate the situation fully.	<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>

RECIRCLtr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
2244	1	It is so clear that so much of our water use is wasteful, from water golf courses, to shipping alfalfa to China, to gutters that flow into the sea and not the watershed. If you are serious about dealing with the drought we will be facing from here on, please address those issues. Don't move forward on a dangerous scheme that will destroy the land we depend on.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project 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>
2245	1	It abandons the legislative requirement for equal goals - both ecological and economic - in favor of only economic goals (if it even provides any of those). Climate change, sea level rise, mass extinctions all show what happens when we ignore the importance of natural functions. The Water Fix just continues that path to destruction.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p>
2246	1	Say no to 35' diameter northern California water diverting tunnels which would be totally destructive of the Bay Delta and the endangered salmon and other endangered fish it supports. These proposed water diverting tunnels would also take away numerous Bay Delta farmers who depend on Bay Delta water. There is no excuse for this proposed travesty - put a stop to it now!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 18 (Agricultural Impact Mitigation).</p>
2247	1	Please do not do this! Think beyond a few years and the horrible impact this would make on California for centuries.	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.

RECIRCltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
2248	1	In addition to that, it will devastate the Delta ecosystem, including the migratory bird flyway. It sacrifices smaller local farmers for large corporate agriculture. We are in a drought! This is a disastrous plan that destroy the Delta and water supplies for Northern California.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The 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 Clean Water Act and federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental.</p>
2249	1	The Delta is not only a critical ecosystem, this project will have a disastrous impact on California as a whole. Limiting high volume water crops such as rice, which is currently grown in an arid Central Valley, and requiring farmers to plant more earth friendly crops would have a better impact on the overall environment. California needs to find better ways of generating water then robbing the few natural resources we have left.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state 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.</p>
2249	2	If we can not sustain our current population, perhaps we have too large a population. This is a poor solution to the existing problems and corrects nothing, other then allowing more unplanned growth within the state. I have lived in the Bay Area my entire life, and I am personally saddened by this growth at the cost of our environment.	The comment raises import policy issues concerning sustainable growth and environmental impacts in California. However, the comment does not question the growth inducement analysis or conclusions of Chapter 30.
2250	1	Faulty engineering has been responsible for many environmental mistakes that have been made all over the world in the name of "progress" and "economic advantage" Please don't let this one be another one. \$15 billion? Which will quickly turn into \$30 billion by the time everyone milks their share and the taxpayers are left holding the bag. And there is no water in the bag!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The issue raised by the commenter addresses the merits of the project and does not raise any issues with the environmental analysis provided in the EIR/S. 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. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need), and Master Response 5 (Cost and Funding).</p>
2251	1	Dear Resources Agency, have you lost your effing minds?! 15 billion to water golf courses, eh? There are hundreds of far, far more worthy projects and needs in California. Maybe colleges? European nations have proven that free college returns 107% on investment. That's more than twice the interest on a savings account. Use your heads! You are college grads, right? Prove it!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 5 regarding costs of implementation and Master Response 3 regarding the need for the project.</p>

RECIRCLtr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
2252	1	In addition, while the north has yellow or dead lawns, Southern California's lawns are green from watering. Southern California needs to stop depending on the water from Northern California! We do not want the Delta to be destroyed like Southern California destroyed the Owens Valley!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
2253	1	The following are other ways this money can be used while conserving our precious Delta: Conserve urban water, recycle municipal wastewater, improve agricultural water efficiency. Manage groundwater sustainably, shore up infrastructure and thin forests.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives.</p>
2254	1	How does stealing water from the Delta and shipping it South "fix" anything except helping corporate agriculture waste water on nuts and let rich people lavish gross amounts of water on their estates.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline. See Master Response 34 (Beneficial Use of Water) and Master Response 35 (Southern California Water Supply)</p>
2255	1	Very expensive fix applied to a political problem--Let's think this through from an environmental perspective, before taking any action.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
2256	1	The latest "Twin Tunnel" proposal has to be one of the most imaginary, simply and wholly un-researched and unplanned, ridiculous and dangerous "marches into oblivion" that I think I've ever heard proposed for any kind of solution to any kind of environmental issue that I've ever seen or heard of in my lifetime.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native</p>

RECIRCLtr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			<p>fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project. Please see Master Response 5 for more information on costs and funding.</p>
2257	1	<p>Please don't be afraid to resist this near-sighted fix that creates more problems -- many of which are unforeseen and possibly devastating to the environment -- and choose a bold direction for California. Let us become innovators of water conservation. The WaterFix is not consistent with that vision. It is a bandaid on a sore that will never go away unless we attack the real source, not the Delta.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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>The project was initiated by former Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, who was twice elected by a majority of California voters. The process has continued under the administration of his successor, Edmund G. Brown, Jr. Hence, the project has been initiated and carried forward by two Governors acting on a mandate from the voters of the State as a whole. Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. The Proposed Project is intended to provide a more reliable water supply, with diversions that are more protective for fish, in accordance with the Delta Reform Act co-equal goals of improving water supply reliability and Delta ecosystem health. Please see Master Response 31 (Delta Reform Act) and Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) for additional information.</p>
2258	1	<p>The "California WaterFix," plan throws habitat conservation to the winds! This plan for a pair of giant tunnels to suck water from the Sacramento River and send it south, robs Delta water from a biome where water is sorely needed for numerous species found only in California.</p> <p>The Tunnels will only most likely complete the devastation of most Delta habitats, but fail to provide any new water. Furthermore, this costly undertaking will rob funds from sensible water programs that do -- such as conservation programs and helping people upgrade to more efficient appliances.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more</p>

RECIRCLtr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.
2259	1	The California WaterFix abandons all habitat conservation and will lead to the destruction of the Delta. The two proposed giant tunnels will suck water from the Sacramento River and send it South, bypassing the Delta where water is sorely needed for numerous species found only in California.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The project proposes to stabilize water supplies, and exports could only increase under certain circumstances. Water deliveries from the federal and state water projects under a fully-implemented Alternative 4A are projected to be about the same as the average annual amount diverted in the last 20 years. Although the proposed project would not increase the overall volume of Delta water exported, it would make the deliveries more predictable and reliable, while restoring an ecosystem in steep decline.</p>
2260	1	<p>It is also flawed because it does not take into account the ecological science that clearly indicates that long term the diversion of water from the Delta has damaging economic as well as environmental implications for the Delta and East Bay areas.</p> <p>Our state has many microclimates, and we need to learn how to leave within the parameters of these, not destroy some of them to repair the overburdening of others. This policy is deeply flawed, short term opportunism and does not serve California, our people or our grandchildren we.</p> <p>There are other solutions. They need to be promoted.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. 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. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p> <p>Socioeconomic effects of the various alternatives are described and assessed in Chapter 16, Socioeconomics, of the 2013 Public Draft BDCP EIR/EIS. A Draft BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report has also been published, which indicates that the BDCP would result in a substantial economic net benefit to the State of California.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives.</p>
2261	1	Tell Southern California to make their own sacrifices and to find other ways to increase their water supplies. Perhaps spend a bit on desalinization?	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>For more information regarding desalination please see Master Response 63. Please see Master Response 35 regarding water use and conservation in Southern California.</p>
2262	1	Californians shut down the peripheral canal once, get the idea. We do not want the	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

RECIRCLtr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		tunnels, we do not want the canal, period!	<p>Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p>
2263	1	This plan will not 'fix' anything but it will lead to further environmental destruction, which will generate further problems. The southern portion of the state, where I live, needs to have its infrastructure drastically re-designed to fit with our actual environment. These systems were designed, allocated, and built in the 1920s which were (though unknown at that time) the wettest decade of the century.	<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 the late 1800s, the Bay-Delta ecosystem has been substantially altered. Changes in key environmental attributes of the Bay-Delta have contributed to the current degraded state of the ecosystem and appear to be proximate causes of declines in desired fishes and increases in non-native species. California WaterFix is not intended to address all the factors that have contributed to the Delta's decline and briefly summarizes a few but not all of those factors. Many factors that have contributed to the decline of the Delta's ecosystem including the conversion of tidal marsh and floodplains to farmland, construction of levees and altering of tide flows, in-Delta and upstream water diversions, contaminant discharges, ammonia and nutrient discharges and changes to the food web, increases in water temperatures, and introduction of non-native and invasive species. The Delta will remain in a highly altered state for the foreseeable future and the project is not intended to address all the past harms or restore the Delta to a pre-altered state.</p> <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 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>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. Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project.</p>
2264	1	This is important, it is time to really pay attention to science, not politics. We cannot afford that any more. Especially if we get a wet year, we can buy time to consider alternatives.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Since 2006, the proposed has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. 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>
2265	1	Do not allow the destruction of the Delta to serve short term gain/profit by Southern California almond exporters and other agribusinesses that are not geographically well	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

RECIRCLtr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		located. DEIR/DEIS is flawed - it does not take into account increasing local water independence.	Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. 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. The issue of crops and water use is beyond the scope of the Proposed Project.
2266	1	We don't need a tunnel that diverts our precious resource to the desert areas of California. If farmers want to grow, they need to grow some thing that grows in the desert landscapes, maybe Jojoba. Especially in a drought period. They should only used and conserve water that is in their area. Diverting our water from the Delta would devastate our Delta commerce and natural habitats.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of a particular water supply augmentation approach (greater agricultural conservation) and does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS. 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. For more information regarding agricultural beneficial water use please see Master Response 34.
2266	2	You can also put a stop to Nestle who is illegally selling California water from Southern California Mountains to whom ever they wish. This does not directly benefit drought stricken Californians. This water can easily be used in those Southern California regions who apparently need water, instead of building a tunnel and diverting water from Northern California. We need our water here in our region. Instead, use the money that seems to be available for a tunnel project, to repair of our natural habitats, so that our commerce in these areas can thrive.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
2267	1	Water Tunnels = bad solution. Care about California's wildlife there, rethink our solution.	This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter. No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project 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.

RECIRCLtr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
2268	1	This tunnel idea is one of the dumbest ideas ever - we like and respect our governor, however, to disrupt our own waters in order to sell water to Southern California is ludicrous! Southern California has the money to find its own sources and live within its own means! We already gave away too much water with the feather river project! No more!	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>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> <p>DWR's fundamental purpose of the proposed project is to make physical and operational improvements to the SWP system in the Delta necessary to restore and protect ecosystem health, water supplies of the SWP and CVP south of the Delta, and water quality within a stable regulatory framework, consistent with statutory and contractual obligations. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.</p> <p>Please see Master Response 3 for additional information regarding the purpose and need behind the proposed project, Master Response 4 regarding the selection of alternatives analyzed, Master Response 6 regarding demand management, and Master Response 37 regarding water storage.</p>
2271	1	Please go back to early studies (1990s) that prove that any further diversion of water will destroy the Delta. Use the funds to repair what is already in trouble.	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. It should be recognized that the proposed diversion plans associated with the project today include substantial safeguards for water quality and fish and aquatic resources.</p>
2272	1	I am writing in opposition to the Twin Tunnels being pushed by Governor Brown here in California. There are so many reasons not to build the tunnels I would like my chance to state them. Firstly, the cost is absolutely astronomical at over \$16 billion for construction alone. Add in the financing and administrative costs and I've heard one economist estimate the final total closer to \$60 billion. For the amount of water at issue it does not compute whatsoever.	<p>The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. 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. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives and Master Response 7 for information on why desalination wasn't included in the proposed project.</p>
2272	2	Running the tunnels through the Delta in California's Central Valley would very negatively impact our fragile ecosystem and potentially allow for salt water intrusion to destroy our aquatic system. This is probably the most important reason for not proceeding with the plan to build the tunnels.	<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>
2272	3	There are so many other cheaper methods of preserving our water and our precious treasure that is the Delta: continued conservation, recharging the aquifer in plentiful water years, storm water recapture and even desalination plants in those water districts willing to go to the expense of building and operating them. Farmers could even do more dry farming where feasible and switch to more drip irrigation thus saving even	<p>Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives.</p>

RECIRCLtr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		more water.	
2272	4	<p>The manner in which these tunnels are being shoved down the throats of those of us most negatively affected by them are totally improper. We have been left out of much of the plans for pushing these tunnels forward. We do not want our farmers pushed off their farms to construct the tunnels. Water should not be diverted to the water-hungry south leaving the Delta damaged. I believe we who live in the region impacted should have a say in what happens here. Please consider our request to put a permanent stop to the Twin Tunnels and save our precious Delta from being destroyed.</p>	<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. Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 32 of the Final EIR/EIS and Master Response 40 for information regarding outreach conducted for California WaterFix (and previously the BDCP). More information on how DWR has developed the project in an open and transparent manner is provided in Master Response 41.</p>
2273	1	<p>Sherman Island is the best example of the ideal location to meet the co-equal goals as required by law, because it is at the western tip of the Delta, where most fresh water rights end and most of the environmental life that we are required to protect with the Delta flows [has] already used the water, and [which is half] the distance to the existing intakes compared to [three] sites currently being considered. Also, we could increase output of our exports without harming the environment if this site is utilized.</p> <p>Comment: Was Sherman Island considered as a site for the new intakes and what are the winning criteria and pros and cons of each site considered? It has been well documented by many that oppose the intakes in Sacramento area that more water can be taken at this location with no adverse effects on the environmental health of the Delta.</p> <p>Pros and Cons:</p> <p>-Costs -- Sherman Island is half the distance, which would mean [half] the cost of the other sites currently under consideration in the proposed Water Fix. 1 x 30' tunnel 20 miles with a water tower will be significantly less cost than 2 x 40' tunnels 37 miles long.</p> <p>-Water Quantity -- Sherman Island using the "Big Gulp" would easily increase the water exported by taking more water in the winter and less in the summer. Sherman Island can add 2 trillion gallons or, in other words, the exports can increase to 10 million acre-feet [MAF] exported in dry years (like 2014) if "Salinity Control Louvers" are added to Benicia Bridge or that area to slow (not stop) the seawater incursion to Sherman Island area. WaterFix is not supposed to supply any more water than today, but the public is skeptical since each tunnel can carry more than 15 million acre-feet a year or a total of 30 MAF instead of the current 5 MAF.</p> <p>-Tunnel size needed -- Sherman Island only needs one 30-foot diameter pipe and a standard height water tower to deliver 10 MAF of water to the existing intakes 20 miles away near Tracy. WaterFix is needing 2 x 40 foot diameter tunnels to go about 37 miles each which combined designed output of 5 MAF a year.</p> <p>-Environment -- Sherman Island causes near zero harm to the environment because the water is at the mixing spot where the salt water would normally (without "Salinity Control Louvers") meet the fresh water. Currently chosen locations would kill aquatic life and a large portion of the Delta farming area due to salt intrusions that DWR indicates would happen because the flows of water by the new locations would take the water need.</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response 4 for additional details on the selection of alternatives. For more information regarding Intake Location Analysis please see Appendix 3F of the FEIR/EIS.</p>

RECIRCLtr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>-Filters -- Sherman Island can use an island filter or ZeeWeed (Ultra Filtration hollow fiber) which both does not kill fish or any part of the aquatic food chain, whereas fish screens and settling ponds kill parts of the food chain and removes it from the waterways and the Delta. No more killing of endangered species. Current WaterFix-designed filters have and will continue to kill endangered species, other aquatic life and disrupt the Delta food web of life.</p> <p>-Energy -- Sherman Island is a great place to get power for pumps or other such uses. Being close to the wind farm and having nearby transmission lines make the location even more ideal than the WaterFix locations.</p> <p>-Tunnel Path -- Sherman Island has an ideal path that only affects the railroad and CalTrans, with the train tracks located to the west and you follow [the] highway directly to Sherman Island. The WaterFix is almost twice the distance to the proposed new intake location but goes under more than 100 properties. Clear choice is the shorter path [that] only affects [two] entities and one is a state agency. See map on subsequent page [ATT3].</p> <p>Flow rates are easily calculated and verified with the following simple web address: http://www.calctool.org/CALC/eng/civil/hazen-williams_g</p>	
2273	2	[ATT1: Comparison of project tunnels and respondent's proposal.]	This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
2273	3	[ATT2: Table showing diagram and calculations of pipe flow rates.]	This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
2273	4	[ATT3: Map of respondent's proposed tunnel alignment.]	This comment describes an attachment to the comment letter. The attachment does not raise any additional issues related to the environmental analysis in the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS that are not already addressed in comment referencing the attachment or the Final EIR/EIS.
2274	1	Spend this money to spur development of water purification technology, and the widespread placement of greywater reclamation systems in private homes. Make greywater recovery systems required in all new construction.	Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management, 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.
2275	1	<p>Please can you tell me where the drawings (volume 2) and the map books (volume 3) accompanying the Conceptual Engineering Reports located in 'supporting technical studies' can be found?</p> <p>Http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/EnvironmentalReview/EnvironmentalReview/SupportingTechnicalStudies.aspx</p>	As of August 2016, Volume 2 and Volume 3 of the Conceptual Engineering Reports have not been published on the website.
2276	1	<p>The "Delta Tunnels" project is an expensive attempt to simply divide existing water resources into ever smaller parts. There are too many risks and too few returns.</p> <p>Monies would be better spent on projects that increase water storage for future use, or for projects that actually tap into new supplies of water (perhaps like desalination).</p> <p>Please do not approve the BDCP/WaterFix plan.</p>	<p>Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 7 for information on desalination and why it was not included as a project alternative.</p> <p>Please see the BDCP Statewide Economic Impact Report (http://baydeltaconservationplan.com/Libraries/Dynamic_Document_Library/Draft_BDCP_Statewide_Economic_Impact_Report_8-5-13.sflb.ashx), which indicates that the BDCP would result in a substantial net economic benefit to the State of California. An updated cost/benefit analysis is currently being conducted</p>

RECIRLtr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			for the current preferred Alternative, 4A. For more information regarding cost and funding please see Master Response 5.
2277	1	The idea is horrible and irresponsible. Start fixing the actual problems and not the "symptoms." Fix the water rights issues, stop growing water-intensive crops in the desert, and invest in water storage, recycling, etc.	Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 34 for additional details on the determination of beneficial use.
2278	1	I am a resident of Marin County and I strongly oppose Governor Brown's proposed tunnels to bring Delta water to Southern California. We should reject this idea and invest [in] water recycling and conservation projects.	Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need.
2279	1	I am incensed as a voter who will not be allowed to vote but only comment on a wide-ranging, expensive and far-reaching project such as the Delta tunnels project.	Please refer to Chapter 32 of the Final EIR/EIS and Master Response 40 for information regarding outreach conducted for California WaterFix (and previously the BDCP). More information on how DWR has developed the project in an open and transparent manner is provided in Master Response 41.
2279	2	The Delta Independent Science Board recently found the tunnel project's Environmental Impact Report inadequate. "The Current Draft lacks completeness and clarity in applying science to far-reaching policy decisions."	For responses to comments related to the Delta Independent Science Board's letters, please refer to comment letters BDCP 1448 and/or RECIRC 2546.
2279	3	Need examples, or do the facts simply get in the way of the Governor's and Legislature's Southern California might over Northern California's minority population compared to total population? Instead of spending \$15 billion to build the Delta tunnels to send more Sacramento River water to grow almonds and hay for export, we should invest in projects that promote groundwater recharge, storm water capture, water recycling, and an expansion of urban conservation projects that worked so well this year. Examples: the San Diego region does not capture enough of its water runoff as there are too many areas where water simply runs from the mountains to the ocean (more salt). Also, why not spend this money on another de-salinization plant in California?	Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management. Also, please see Master Response 34 for additional details on the determination of beneficial use.
2281	1	This is what needs to happen: Instead of spending \$15 billion to build the Delta tunnels to send more Sacramento River water to grow almonds and hay for export, we should invest in projects that promote groundwater recharge, storm water capture, water recycling, and an expansion of urban conservation projects that worked so well this year. If this nonsense is not done right it is time for people to vote these jokers out of office!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. 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. Also, please see Master Response 3 for additional details on the project purpose and need and Master Response 34 for additional details on the determination of beneficial use.
2282	1	I cannot begin to express my disgust in the fact that this project has continued to be pushed forward with public misinformation and without voter approval. The tunnels will ruin the Delta, destroy local farms, kill fish as we look to rivers and oceans for food, and damage the economy from San Francisco Bay to Sacramento.	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.
2282	2	The people in Southern California simply do not have a clue about water conservation and from what I have seen they are doing little to nothing to help reduce water consumption during the drought. In Northern California people are letting their lawns die and dirt cake onto their car hoods and roofs. Every time I have been to Southern California in the last year I have seen green grass in the medians, yards being	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

RECIRCLtr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		<p>over-watered with run off into the gutters, and everyone washing their car.</p> <p>I urge you to reconsider this massive ecological and environmental disaster of a project and look to conservation of water in the areas where it is needed rather than take it from an area that is already struggling with what little water it has.</p>	<p>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 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. 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. For more information regarding the beneficial uses of water please see Master Response 34.</p>
2282	3	<p>The signs on the side of I-5 that read "Stop the Congress Created Dust Bowl!" are just ludicrous. Those farmers are trying to grow water intensive crops in the dessert! Do they not look at the natural flora around their farms? It's scrub grass and tumble weeds! The only reason anything grows there is because of the massive irrigation! How can you punish the farmers growing crops next to the California Delta by sending their local water hundreds of miles to people trying to grow crops in the desert?</p>	<p>State constitutional restrictions require the reasonable and beneficial use of water and state law requires that water supplied from the Delta be put to beneficial uses. The Lead Agencies do not have the authority to designate what water deliveries are used for. Please refer to Master Response 34 regarding the potential uses of water delivered via proposed conveyance facilities.</p>
2283	1	<p>The priority has to be increased water storage. Rebuild the levees yes, but to invest in a new conveyance system when we may not have enough predictable water to convey is very irresponsible and a huge waste of taxpayer money.</p> <p>Less snow and increased southern warm winter storms will mean huge investments in localized storage, not betting all of our investment on the tunnels to no where.</p>	<p>The commenter offers an opinion on the merits of a particular water supply augmentation approach (more storage) and does not raise a specific issue related to the adequacy of the EIR/EIS. Please see Master Response 37 regarding water storage.</p>
2284	1	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the BDCP/California WaterFix Public Review Partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report/Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement. On OMWD [Olivenhain Municipal Water District]'s behalf, I am writing to express support for California WaterFix in general and Alternative 4A specifically.</p> <p>Our review of the RDEIR/SDEIS confirms that Alternative 4A is a well-founded, viable solution to California's water supply challenges. The Bay-Delta region represents a critically important aspect of our water supply infrastructure, fundamentally crucial not only to California as a whole but for San Diego County as well, especially given ongoing drought conditions.</p> <p>OMWD appreciates the extraordinary efforts that state and federal agencies have undertaken in order to move the pumping station to the south Delta and reduce impacts to Delta communities, along with efforts to develop a northern intake that has the ability to produce significant supplies from large individual storms. The reduction in total dissolved solids in the water supply resulting from these improvements is of particular importance as water purveyors contend with increasing salinity in recycled water.</p> <p>While we acknowledge that they are not a part of the RDEIR/SDEIS, we do keenly await the issuance of a detailed financing plan for California WaterFix as well as detailed cost-sharing arrangements. We would like to emphatically support that the planning</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>

RECIRCltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		process should not be held up until such time as each dollar has been secured.	
2285	1	I am against the water tunnels of Governor Brown. We have a right to vote and have it on the ballot as it would be defeated and the Governor knows it as does the corrupt political people and the Governor's special interest groups. Please no water tunnels! Listen to the American/Californian People.....Not the ego of Sacramento Capital!	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS.
2286	1	We are writing to express our deep opposition to the proposed Delta Tunnels. We think they are a bad and unnatural solution that will cause more troubles down the line than they correct.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.
2287	1	We are against the twin tunnels. They will take vital water from the Delta and cause great ecological and economic damage.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
2288	1	After speaking at length with the biological assessment scientists and contributors to the EIR at the general public meeting in Walnut Grove this past summer, I was somewhat assured that the impacts of the tunnels, once operational, on fish and wildlife in the Delta had been addressed. The key is that when the flow rate reaches 36,000 cfs [cubic feet per second] or higher that up to 9,000 cfs can be drawn off for transfer via the tunnels with minimal impact on the Delta ecosystem. So, the question remains, if the tunnels have a capacity of up to 15,000 cfs, how could we be assured that the draw to the tunnels was held at 9,000 cfs? Past history has shown that the regulations and restrictions to control volumes of river water that are diverted have not been adhered to and in fact in some cases have been circumvented. How can the people of California be assured that all agencies involved will "play by the rules"? In my opinion, that is the bottom line. The fact that the capacity of the tunnels is 66% higher than the maximum diversion in and of itself is suspect. While the EIR may in fact have some aspects which are basically sound, the actual operations of the system once in place and the integrity of the agencies, private parties and governing officials is the only assurance we have that the Delta ecosystem will not be destroyed. That would require some form of compromise in which the size of the tunnels were reduced to say 10,000 cfs and that a series of highly draconian penalties were put in place to assure that the maximum diversions per the EIR were adhered to. So far, DWR and the Governor have ignored any of these recommendations.	The proposed project, Alternative 4A, includes construction of three new intakes in the north Delta and a conveyance capacity of 9,000 cfs (not 15,000 cfs). For more information on conveyance capacity for all of the project alternatives, please see Chapter 3 in the FEIR/EIS. Also, see Chapter 5 and appendices for information on modeled deliveries and exports under the project alternatives. Operations under any of the project alternatives will be required to comply with existing and future environmental regulations and operating criteria, including those in D1641 and the 2008 USFWS and 2009 NMFS Biological Opinions.
2288	2	The entire concept of the tunnels and how it is being processed for approvals without an actual vote of the people of California, while it may be legal, does not account for any type of general consensus and in fact continues to reinforce the lack of trust in or respect for the people we elect and their appointed officials. I do not expect that these comments will be considered or any real steps will be taken to address the demand vs. capacity issue.	The comment does not raise any environmental issue related to the 2015 RDEIR/SDEIS or the 2013 DEIR/EIS. Please refer to Master Response 42 regarding the treatment of comments. 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

RECIRCLtr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			considered independently through the State, they are beyond the scope of the project.
2289	1	<p>I am writing to express my strong objection to Governor Brown’s misguided Delta Tunnels Plan. The Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta features not only a unique and fragile ecological system, it is also home to a unique and fragile economic and cultural system that would be endangered by the export of vital water supplies. Delta farmlands were created by Chinese laborers who built the levees in the 19th century, then created a series of robust agricultural communities from Antioch to Sacramento. As expressed by California writer Sucheng Chan, who started the Asian Studies Department at UC Santa Barbara and is one of the leading scholars of California agriculture:</p> <p>“Perhaps nowhere else in California has an area’s social structure so closely mirrored its biological and physical ecological balance [than in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta]. People of many different ethnic backgrounds have worked together closely for 130 years to make the Delta into one of the few places left in rural California where third-, fourth- and even fifth-generation descendants of some of the early settlers continue to farm the land in a complex pattern of interaction between man nature, and between one ethnic group and another. In this historical development, Asian immigrants have played a central role. More than any other place in rural California, the Delta has provided the conditions conducive to the establishment of relatively stable and settled Asian communities. Chinese have been involved in all stages of farm-making in the Delta: reclaiming the swamps, clearing the land, breaking up the sod for cultivation, leasing part of the land to grow crops, and harvesting and packing them for marketing.”</p> <p>So not only are fish, fowl and farms at stake, but the unique Delta blend of cultures and races. Please abandon this destructive plan to drain the Delta.</p>	<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.</p> <p>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 the following chapters of the EIR/EIS: Chapter 11 (Aquatic Resources), Chapter 12 (Terrestrial Resources), Chapter 14 (Agriculture), Chapter 18 (Cultural), and Chapter 28 (Environmental Justice).</p> <p>Refer to Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need) and Master Response 24 (Delta As A Place).</p>
2290	1	How can removal of vast quantities of fresh water upriver not seriously worsen saltwater intrusion downriver?	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. 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.
2291	1	I am a waterfront property owner in Isleton. I strongly urge that this measure not be approved. I feel this will destroy the delta as we know it. Let southern California get there water from the ocean. DO NOT STEAL OUR WATER. The eco system will not survive the salt water intrusion.	<p>No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised.</p> <p>The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. Effects of the alternatives on salinity levels are described in Chapter 8, Water Quality. Modeling results indicate that the implementation of the water conveyance facilities may positively or adversely affect in-Delta water quality, depending on a number of factors including location, time of year, and hydrologic conditions. 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. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).</p>
2292	1	I would like to let it be known that I am totally against this project. The impact on the San Joaquin Valley where I live and the cost of this project are too great. I think there are alternate solutions to solving our water problems in the state. Since most of the moisture comes from upper northern California (which I believe is significant) why don’t we figure out how to contain and facilitate moving this water to the lower portions of the state. Between the twin tunnels and the ridiculous bullet train I am totally	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

RECIRCltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		disappointed with our state decision makers. It always seems to boil down to politics of the people currently in charge and their "legacies" which disgusts me. A benefit to some doesn't make it a right decision.	fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility.
2293	1	I favor keeping all rivers, the Delta, habitat, and native plants and animals the way nature put it. The earth will take care of our needs if we take care of its needs.	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such it is intended to be environmentally beneficial, not detrimental. By establishing a point of water diversion in the north Delta and new operating criteria to improve water volume, timing, and salinity, the proposed project is designed to improve native fish migratory patterns and allow for greater operational flexibility. See Master Response 3 (Purpose and Need).
2294	1	I am not in favor of the plan to build tunnels to take water from the Sacramento River and the Delta. With an estimated cost of \$15 billion, the people of California deserve a better solution and a more prudent investment to address the state's water supply needs. This project will cause further harm to the unique and fragile Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. Nearly 4 million people call the Delta region home (my wife and I are among them), which includes 2,500 farmers who contribute \$2 billion to the California economy each year. This so-called WaterFix plan does not provide any new water and would severely impact Delta communities. I do not want to see this area become another Owens Valley where many years ago, water was diverted from the Owens Valley area to the Los Angeles area and now Owens Lake is dry. Given the "significant and unavoidable" impacts the Twin Tunnels ultimately will have, the Northern San Joaquin Valley is destined to become another Owens Valley. This will mean no growth, farmers barely hanging on, and environmental devastation with the added bonus of greater economic misery. I urge you to not approve the Delta Tunnels.	The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor include any regulatory actions that would affect water rights holders other than DWR, Reclamation, and SWP and CVP contractors. Importantly, all water exported by the SWP and CVP is subject to the existing water rights of those two agencies. Exports do not come at the expense of other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives analyzed in the EIR/EIS only include the use of water from existing SWP and CVP water rights or voluntary water transfers from other water rights holders. The proposed project and its alternatives do not reduce the protections for other water right holders. 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. Through the Legislature and through executive agencies, California has embraced water conservation on numerous fronts, as have many California water agencies. Many of these efforts are highlighted in Appendix 1C, Demand Management Measures, EIR/EIS, which describes conservation, water use efficiency, and other sources of water supply, including recycled water. While these elements are not proposed as part of the project, the Lead Agencies recognize that they are important tools in managing California's water resources. 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. For more information regarding alternatives development, water demand management, and purpose and need please see Master Response 4, Master Response 6, and Master Response 3.
2295	1	I am opposed to digging the tunnels and diverting freshwater away from the delta. The EIR does not adequately address issues related to salt water intrusion into the San Francisco Bay delta or the increased hazards to endangered species diverting freshwater from the system will lead to.	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. Chapter 8, Water Quality, discloses the potential water quality impacts resulting from constructing and operating the proposed project. See also Master Response 14 (Water Quality).
2296	1	The proposed tunnels will permanently change the Delta. Combined with the effect of increased salt water intrusion due to climate change, the tunnels' impact due to decreasing the Sacramento River fresh water flow will be a catastrophe waiting to	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.

RECIRCLtr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		happen. This is a fundamentally bad idea, especially with so many alternatives.	
2297	1	<p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Delta Tunnels/California Water Fix (Alternative 4A)</p> <p>The Delta watershed is already oversubscribed by five times in normal water years. There is no way to create “new” water. Less exported, rather than more, is the only way to sustain the environmental, public health and economic viability of the California Delta.</p> <p>The Delta Reform Act of 2009, in which the California State Legislature committed to the “coequal goals” of providing a more reliable water supply for California AND protecting and restoring the cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of the Delta, cannot be upheld if the Delta Tunnels come to pass.</p> <p>The Delta tunnels plan does nothing to increase or make our water supply reliable. Instead, we need to prioritize funds for conservation, groundwater recharge, recycling, storm water capture and new technologies leading to regional self-sufficiency at a far cheaper cost.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>The EIR/EIS was prepared in a manner to comply with the 2009 Delta Reform Act, including sections that are included in this comment, as described in Appendix 3I, BDCP Compliance with the 2009 Delta Reform Act, of the EIR/EIS.</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>All of the alternatives evaluated in the EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights that were issued to DWR and Reclamation by the State Water Board with consideration for senior water rights and Area of Origin laws and requirements. Senior water rights holders are not affected by implementation of action alternatives. The amount of water that DWR and Reclamation would be able to pump from the proposed north Delta facilities is set by Federal regulating agencies, ESA compliance and project design, and not by the water contractors. Operations for the proposed project would still be consistent with the criteria set by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service biological opinions and State Water Resources Control Board Water Right Decision 1641 (D-1641), subject to adjustments made pursuant to the adaptive management process, as described in Chapter 5, Water Supply of the EIR/S. In addition to permitting constraints on daily operations of the SWP and CVP, DWR and Reclamation must maintain proper performance and bypass flows across fish screens when endangered and threatened fish species are present within the north Delta facilities area.</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 http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/decision_1641/index.shtml) and additional limitations described in the Federal Endangered Species Section 7 Biological Opinions and take permits (see http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvo/ocap_page.html).</p> <p>The project is just one element of the state’s long-range strategy to meet anticipated future water needs of Californians in the face of expanding population and the expected effects of climate change. The project is</p>

RECIRCLtr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			not a comprehensive, statewide water plan, but is instead aimed at addressing many complex and long-standing issues related to the operations of the SWP and CVP in the Delta, including reliability of exported supplies. It is important to note that the project is not intended to serve as a statewide solution to all of California's water problems, and it is not an attempt to address directly the need for continued investment by the State and other public agencies in conservation, storage, recycling, desalination, treatment of contaminated aquifers, or other measures to expand supply and storage (as described in Section 1.C.3 of Appendix 1C, Water Demand Management). Changes water deliveries and surface water flows in the Sacramento Valley under the action alternatives as compared to the Existing Conditions and the No Action Alternative are presented in Chapter 5 and Appendix 5A of the EIR/EIS; and associated changes in aquatic resources along the Sacramento River are presented in Chapter 11 of the EIR/EIS.
2297	2	<p>As a Resident of the Delta and sailing her waters for many years, I must impress upon you the primal uniqueness of the Delta ecosystem I know. The largest estuary on the West Coast, it is the breeding ground of abundance for the northern Pacific Ocean.</p> <p>Yet, already threatened by years of urban tampering and over pumping, water quality for humans, today, is unhealthy for contact. California is shamed that this beautiful resource is not fit for recreational water sports, We should do better in the 21st century. The tunnel project is, however, one of destruction. California needs a sustainable water management plan that recognizes the importance of the health of the Estuary.</p>	No issues related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S were raised. The proposed project was developed to meet the rigorous standards of the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, as such the proposed project is intended to be environmentally beneficial. Please refer to Master Response 3 regarding purpose and need.
2297	3	<p>Ditch the tunnel plan! Too much time and money already spent on this special interest project. There are feasible and cost effective alternatives to deliver drinking water, sustainable water rights and environmental restoration.</p> <p>Reclamation and DWR should prepare and circulate a new Draft EIR/EIS that will include alternatives that reduce water exports and increase Delta flows for consideration by the public and decision-makers. Such alternatives have a far better chance of complying with the Delta Reform Act and the federal Endangered Species and Clean Water Acts.</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. Please refer to Master Response 6 for additional details on demand management Also, please refer to Master Response 4 and 31 for additional details on the selection of alternatives and compliance with CEQA and NEPA and the Delta Reform Act.</p> <p>As described in Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, EIR/EIS, comments and suggestions received from the State Water Board were influential in defining the range and content of alternatives considered in the EIR/EIS, including the State Water Board's Delta Flow Criteria Report, prepared pursuant to the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Reform Act of 2009. Scoping comments from the State Water Board included requests for an alternative providing for reduced diversions and an alternative incorporating changes to Delta outflows (and potentially inflows) that would reflect a more natural hydrograph. The Lead Agencies determined that an additional alternative would be required to be responsive to the State Water Board's comments. Informed by these comments, as well as several letters from the State Water Board to the Natural Resources Agency, DWR met with State Water Board staff to identify a general approach to model an increased spring Delta outflow alternative. This alternative was designed to increase spring Delta outflow by approximately 1.5 million acre-feet, on average, above the NEPA baseline assumptions. This became Alternative 8 as analyzed in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>Consideration of the specific determination contained in the Delta Flow Criteria Report, which identified 75% of unimpaired net Delta outflow for January through June, would not have been feasible to include as an alternative in the BDCP EIR/EIS. A letter from the Executive Director of the State Water Board to the deputy secretary of the Natural Resources Agency on April 19, 2011 recognized that the determination did not consider the competing needs for water or other public trust resource needs, such as the need to manage cold-water resources in tributaries to the Delta. Further, implementation of these flows would also likely affect water users beyond those receiving CVP and SWP deliveries south of the Delta. As described in Section 3A.3.5, alternatives requiring impairment of senior water rights held by entities not participating in the BDCP were eliminated from full consideration in the EIR/EIS, as such rights could not be infringed by CDFW, USFWS, or NMFS through those agencies' actions in response to an HCP/NCCP application filed by DWR (HCP alternatives) or through "ESA Section 7 consultation" (Alternative 4A, 2D, 5A) with Reclamation. Please refer</p>

RECIRCLtr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
			to Master Response 45 (Permitting) and Master Response 29 (ESA Section 7).
2298	1	<p>I live in the Sacramento River watershed and strongly oppose the California Water Fix, the Governor's latest plan to drain the vitality from the North State. Our homes, businesses, farms, and wildlands depend on healthy groundwater, creeks, and streams. The BDCP/WaterFix and its related EIR/EIS do not comply with State water law and inadequately assess the environmental and socioeconomic impacts. The actions of the BDCP/WaterFix would damage the region's economy, environment and communities.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the current proposal.</p>	<p>Operation of the project water delivery system could not drain the Delta rivers and channels dry, including the Sacramento River. 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.</p> <p>The EIR/EIS evaluates potential changes in water resources, other physical resources (e.g. air quality), biological resources, and human resources (including economic conditions) with implementation of the action alternatives as compared to the No Action Alternative and Existing Conditions.</p>
2299	1	<p>We have to be honest and do what is best for California's future. We have already done too much to degrade the Bay Area's water. It's our time to take care of our resources.</p>	<p>This comment letter is in part a form letter that has been submitted by many commenters. To locate the response to the form letter portion of the comment, please refer to the index of commenters in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS, and cross reference the Form Master letter number shown there with the index of Form Masters also provided in Chapter 4 of Volume II of the Final EIR/EIS. The text below responds to the specific substantive portions of the comment letter that were submitted by the commenter.</p> <p>Since 2006, the proposed project has been developed based on sound science, data gathered from various agencies and experts over many years, input from agencies, stakeholders and independent scientists, and more than 600 public meetings, working group meetings and stakeholder briefings. The project would help to address the resilience and adaptability of the Delta to climate change through water delivery facilities combined with a range of operational In addition to the added water management flexibility created by new water diversions and operational scenarios, the project would improve habitat, increase food supplies and reduce the effects of other stressors on the Delta ecosystem.</p>