

| Last Name | First Name | Comment # | Comment | Relation to Final EIR/EIS |
|-----------|--|-----------|--|--|
| | Larry (kluso1@aol.com) | 1. | Please do NOT allow this project | This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Abbott | Cyndi | 2. | <p>With regards to the Final California WaterFix aka Delta Tunnel plan.....30 days to review comments is not near long enough. It would greatly appreciated (and only fair) to extend the comment period to 90 days.</p> <p>Here are just a few reasons I believe the comment period should be extended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * I don't feel the comments were adequately responded to and this alone requires further comments! * The Draft EIR/S, which had a failing grade from the USEPA, should have been recirculated for further public comment. It seems this 30 days comment period is being used to substitute for that required recirculation, which should have been out long ago. Because the rules (law) were not followed at the time of the original failing grade, we should be allowed at least 90 days for comments and hold a public meeting. * It does not appear that an adequate range of alternatives have been considered. Including, but not limited to, any alternatives with storage or any other portfolio elements. * Did not comply with the Delta Reform Act - which says any preferred alternative should reduce reliance on the Delta. <p>I feel strongly that these are all major failures that need to be addressed in additional comments and we need at least 90 days to issue further comments.</p> | This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Adams | Betty | 3. | <p>I live in the Delta and over the past 11 years our water situation has gotten worse every year. This year we had toxic blue.green algae in our backyard (which is the Delta) and we could have no bodily contact without threatening our health and lives. Blue green algae is caused by inadequate water exchange - there was not enough fresh water in the Delta to prevent this ecological disaster. It seems all the fresh water is being sent south so that farmers can profit from it, without regard for the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta ecosystem.</p> <p>You failed to recirculate a draft EIR after the first received a failing grade from USEPA. It is my opinion that you should allow at least a 90 day comment period, and hold a public hearing now.</p> <p>You also failed to comply with the Delta Reform Act. The Delta is dying and you seem to be the cause.</p> | This comment is about water quality and the Delta Reform Act .This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Aikins | Jim | 4. | I'm writing to express my objection regarding blocking the waterways of the delta for construction. It is my understanding that blockages could occur for a number of years which would be detrimental to the | This comment is about recreation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |

| | | | | |
|------------|-------|----|--|--|
| | | | <p>local economy and recreational activities associated with the delta. The community of Discovery Bay is a waterfront housing community, most homes having docks for their watercraft with an estimated 1500+ boats that uses the delta for fishing, watersports and pleasure. I keep my boat at Whiskey Slu Marina and I also frequent the area that would be affected by the construction. The restaurant, Union Point located at one end of what we call Victoria Slough would see a decline in customers affecting their business due to blocked boat traffic of Victoria Slough. Another option needs to be found other than blocking this waterway and others that are used on a daily basis by the local communities.</p> | |
| Alexandrou | Yorgo | 5. | I am requesting a 90 day comment extension. | This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Allvey | Rick | 6. | <p>I'm writing to you because I'm a concerned citizen, very concerned on the water tunnel project proposed by Governor Jerry Brown.</p> <p>I have property in Discovery Bay and by the look of the proposed route and plan to build the tunnels it will affect property values, way of life, recreation and the delta Eco system.</p> <p>I do not feel the tunnels is the right answer to California's water issue..... We do not have enough water as it is let alone trying to pump water out of the delta. The proposed construction project and tunnels operation "Violate the law" and/or "Violet water code § 85045"</p> <p>A better solution to invest in is</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Desalination we have plenty of salt water, California sits on the Pacific Ocean. 2. Pump lots more water into the aquifers at times like now when we have way too much water. 3. I've seen this solar project that looks very promising web site waterfx.co they can convert polluted water or salt water into clean drinkable water very cost affective. We should invest in this technology. 4. Build more reservoirs to store more water. <p>Why can't we invest in projects that invest in building expandability, the tunnel project is not solving the water problem in California..... we need more water moving what little we have to another location is not</p> | This comment is about alternatives selection, recreation, and socioeconomic impacts. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |

| | | | | |
|---------|-----------------|-----|--|--|
| | | | fixing the problem. | |
| Baca | David | 7. | I am a resident of Discovery Bay. Please don't build the twin tunnels. The tunnels will deteriorate our water quality and water quantity. The ecosystem and environment will be damaged and the delta will become brackish. Wildlife and plant species will be destroyed, not to mention boating and recreation. The tunnels will have a devastating butterfly effect on the coastal fisheries, local agricultural and recreation and tourism. | This comment is about water quality, terrestrial resources, aquatics, recreation, and agriculture. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Barnes | Laurelee | 8. | Please extend the comment period to at least 90 days for the Delta Tunnels Thank you! | This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Barros | Jenifer and Ken | 9. | My husband and I live on the delta and whole heartedly oppose the building of these tunnels. We have lived on or near these rivers our entire lives. We have used these rivers all our lives. It would be tragic to lose this valuable resource. The tradeoff for a tunnel is too much. I feel it would destroy our communities as well as the state. | This comment is about socioeconomic impacts. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Baumann | Chris | 10. | Please extend the comment period. | This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Baumann | Chris | 11. | I am a water skier, boater and home owner on fast water in Discovery Bay. I purchased my home for the benefit of the quick access for these activities and believe the Tunnel project is a threat to the value of my home and the lifestyle I have invested in. This Tunnel project directly affects myself and my family and we object to it vigorously. The bigger picture is the threat these Tunnels pose to the Wetlands and Wildlife refuge, the long term health of this area is at risk. This project presents huge long term problems and deserves further studies and evaluation prior to siphoning off water which may cripple the future health and economic climate of this area. | This comment is about recreation and socioeconomic impacts. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Behiel | Scott | 12. | I understand you are in the process of an EIR to build two docks to accept barges on the delta's Twin Sloughs. Recreational boating is a huge industry in that region and must be encouraged and respected. If barges need access to the islands, please consider building the docks around the corners so that they do not impact water sports on the Twin Sloughs. If boaters are displaced from the sloughs, they will be forced to go farther from their marinas to more dangerous waters. The impact would be a larger carbon footprint as more gas will be needed to get in a ski run and the wake board, ski and surf boats will have to compete with the larger, faster boats on the bigger parts of the river. This will | This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |

| | | | | |
|---------|-------------------------|-----|---|--|
| | | | <p>result in a less enjoyable experience at best, and injuries or death at worst.</p> <p>Again, please put more consideration to the current use of the delta's waters before unnecessarily disrupting those uses.</p> | |
| Beley | Gene | 13. | <p>Please extend the Delta tunnels comment period that is now due Jan. 22. People are just rebounding from the holiday season and need more time for sure.</p> | <p>This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| Bittner | Judy (via Jan McCleery) | 14. | <p>How can a handful of politicians make decisions for a community that is totally dependent on the waterways that supply it.</p> <p>The residents of the delta communities have invested their lives and incomes to be a part of a unique community of over 15,000 not to mention the thousands of boaters who utilize this area all year long.</p> <p>Not only do these tunnels post a threat to the economic future of the delta communities but the ecological affect is mind boggling.</p> <p>For a state that is afraid of crossing the path of a red legged frog, how can any of you even consider ruining thousands of miles of wetlands that host myriad of wildlife, farmlands and eco structure.</p> <p>NO! NO! NO! TO THE TUNNELS</p> | <p>This comment is about recreation, agriculture, terrestrial and aquatic resources. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| Borison | Pat | 15. | <p>I am concerned that the proposed "Water Fix" and Delta tunnels have not adequately considered the economic and recreational impacts of the project on Discovery Bay and the South Delta. I am also objecting to the short time allowed for response and review, and that the document – as seems often to be the case – was released during holiday periods.</p> <p>Various reviews of this project have never given serious analysis to the serious impacts to the South Delta, other than to acknowledge that they will be numerous and negative.</p> <p>One of the alternatives, Alternative 9 -- is even worse; it will essentially destroy the Discovery Bay boating (and therefore real estate) industry.</p> <p>I have lived in Discovery Bay for 17 years and enjoyed boating, fishing, swimming and the Delta lifestyle. Discovery Bay is a thriving community. Besides recreation, we support local farms and businesses.</p> <p>Projects in the Delta, according to the Delta Reform Act and the Delta Plan are supposed to achieve their objectives "in a manner that protects and enhances the unique cultural, recreational, natural</p> | <p>This comment is about recreation, water quality and the Delta Reform Act. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |

| | | | | |
|---------|------|-----|---|---|
| | | | <p>resource and agricultural values of the Delta..." We have already seen the impact of low water levels during the drought; water in Discovery Bay was unswimmable for much of the summer and fall due to toxic algae. When the tunnels start drawing water, the result may well be even worse. Toxic algae, increased salinity and other problems will NOT enhance recreational and agricultural values and will have severe economic impacts.</p> <p>The tunnels do not comply with California Water Code section 85045 and are therefore illegal.</p> <p>Navigation is another concern. Boaters have always had a guarantee of navigation. The railroad bridge on Middle River was required as a backup in case the one on Old River was inoperable. Alternative 9 – the Through Delta/Separate Corridors proposal, was included as an alternate to the tunnels, yet it is even worse, and will essentially cut Discovery Bay off from recreational boating. It violates guarantees of navigation and needs to be removed from consideration.</p> <p>In 2009 an earlier plan proposed "gates" (really dams) blocking Middle River and Connection Sloughs. We learned then how dangerous to boating these gates or dams could be.</p> <p>The bottom line is that the proposed tunnels (Water Fix) and their Alternate 9 create more damage than provide solutions to California's water problems. The Delta is a unique California resource. To destroy it when other solutions – conservation, better agricultural watering systems, storage, fixing leaky pipes, etc. - are available is insanity.</p> <p>Do not write off Discovery Bay and its broad recreational, economic and cultural values.</p> | |
| Borison | Pat | 16. | <p>I just found out yesterday -- Jan. 16 -- that the deadline to comment on the Delta Tunnels EIR is Jan. 22 -- less than six days away. I also just found out that you had responded to the comments I and others sent a couple of years ago. Six days is not enough time to review and digest this massive EIR or to analyze your responses to my comments. I thought an amended or corrected draft EIR would be published after the EPA faulted the plan. I also thought the amended EIR would, as many requested, look at a wider range of alternatives to the tunnels, including those that included storage. Please extend the comment period at least 90 days, so there is time to adequately make comments.</p> | <p>This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| Bowman | Jill | 17. | <p>We moved to Discovery Bay almost two years ago. The sole reason for our move? Our children. Moving out of this state is not an option for me. I researched towns to live where I could still keep my same job, which we solely rely on for our family. We landed on Discovery Bay for many different reasons, but the sole reason was for my children and</p> | <p>This comment is about socioeconomic impacts. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--------|-------|-----|---|---|
| | | | <p>their future. A school within several hundred feet was reopening because enough people had finally moved back out here after the recession devastated this community. We have built back up property values and the draw to our summer activities is what keeps this mighty town sustainable. The tunnels would DEVASTATE this community once again. Devastate the schools, devastate the families that can't afford nearby wealthier towns, devastate MY FAMILY. You are dealing with actual lives here. Do not proceed with this project.</p> | |
| Brodie | Colin | 18. | <p>please accept my desire that the waterways near Discovery Bay, especially Twin Sloughs, close Connection Slough, South Delta and Mildred Island, be in no way affected by the proposed Delta Tunnels project.</p> <p>These are prime areas for fisherman, boaters and water recreation of all types that are critical to our local and regional economy.</p> <p>With all the rain we have experienced in the past month a water retention system (reservoir), that could have already been in place, would solve much of the central valley and southern california regions water problems for sometime to come. This would also be a long term solution that doesn't involve a radical change in the ecological balance of the Delta water system. With the Delta Tunnels we may be heading toward another "dry" or "saline" situation as has been the case so many times before when the state decided that water should be shipped south, no matter the long term cost.</p> <p>thank you for considering my request and letting me know what your thoughts might be regarding my ideas.</p> | <p>This comment is about recreation and alternatives selection. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| Brodie | Colin | 19. | <p>Please extend the comment period to at least 90 days.</p> <p>Three reasons to extend the comment period and hold a public hearing(s):</p> <p>A) The electorates original comments were not adequately responded to.</p> <p>B) All available alternatives need to be considered. For instance, storage or any other portfolio elements.</p> <p>C) to recirculate the Draft EIR/S after it received a failing grade from USEPA. Under the law they are required to fix the problems and recirculate a draft EIR for further public comment when that happens. I do not think it fair to use this final 30 day comment period to substitute for the required recirculation which should have been a long time ago and allowed for a much longer comment period.</p> | <p>This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--------|--------|-----|--|--|
| | | | Because of this they should allow at least 90 days and hold a public hearing now. | |
| Brodie | Colin | 20. | <p>Please extend the comment period to at least 90 days.</p> <p>Three reasons to extend the comment period and hold a public hearing(s):</p> <p>A) The electorates original comments were not adequately responded to.</p> <p>B) All available alternatives need to be considered. For instance, storage or any other portfolio elements.</p> <p>C) to recirculate the Draft EIR/S after it received a failing grade from USEPA. Under the law they are required to fix the problems and recirculate a draft EIR for further public comment when that happens. I do not think it fair to use this final 30 day comment period to substitute for the required recirculation which should have been a long time ago and allowed for a much longer comment period.</p> <p>Because of this they should allow at least 90 days and hold a public hearing now.</p> | This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Brown | Scott | 21. | <p>I have been following the multi-year attempts by the Governor to build tunnels on the Delta. While we all understand the importance of water to our communities, we also want the lifestyle we have enjoyed for the past 40 years protected and enhanced. Your current plan destroys this for at least the next decade while you build the tunnels.</p> <p>I am a resident of Contra Costa and a boater on the Delta outside of Discovery Bay. In reviewing your most recent EIR, you are proposing to close off at least one, if not two, of the main routes boaters use to access the delta for a decade. From following the proceedings, I am aware there are other more viable proposals, if this plan even needs to go through.</p> <p>I would ask the commission and Federal agencies to yet again go back to the drawing board and address the concerns of the Discovery Bay community as you have in prior EIR studies, all of which acknowledged the importance of the recreational user to the community and economy.</p> | This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Bryan | Haddon | 22. | <p>Please cease all plans for construction on the Twin Sloughs. This is Discovery Bay's backyard and not only is it our playground for recreational water sports, it is home to many communities of aquatic flora and fauna.</p> <p>Please consider all alternative routes for your plan, and make sure it</p> | This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |

| | | | | |
|----------|---------|-----|---|--|
| | | | doesn't impede on the residents who use it, or the communities that enjoy it. | |
| Campbell | Ann | 23. | <p>I am writing to comment on your groups plans for restricting access to areas in the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There has been insufficient time to review the responses to RBOC and other comments, the public comment deadline should be extended. 2. The proposed restrictions on navigable waterways during construction are unconstitutional. 3. The planned temporary closure of Twin Sloughs and Mildred Island are unacceptable, unmitigated and unconstitutional. <p>I have been a recreational boater in this area for 15 years. The planned restrictions are unacceptable to me and many of my colleagues. Please be more responsive to our comments.</p> | [Comment received after the end of 30-day NEPA review period on January 30, 2017] This comment is about recreation specifically boat navigation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Capra | Anthony | 24. | I wholeheartedly object to your proposed closing of twin sloughs. I encourage you to take a ride on a spring/summer day and see with your own eyes they amount of use this area gets. The closure would result in major congestion on waters not suited for heavy traffic. | This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Cheney | Mike | 25. | My son just sent me a link that describes a terrible plan for running water tunnels through an area that we use almost every day of the spring and summer months. We also bought our home in Discovery Bay just for the purpose of water recreation with our family. The plan to block off Twin Sloughs, or North Victoria and Woodward Canals seems like the state does not take into consideration that this is one of the most well traveled waterways in all of the California Delta. Right next to this planned construction zone lies Discovery Bay, a town with over 2,000 waterfront homes that on average have at least two watercraft per house. We are talking at minimum 5,000 watercraft that are permanently held here. Not to mention the 1,000 or so in dry-storage at the Discovery bay Marina, or the 500 boats that are docked in the water, AND the approximately 250 watercraft that launch from here on any given summer weekend day. With this plan set to take 11 years (I can't remember the last public work project that finished on time) this is a decision that should not be taken lightly. This is absurd that this plan was even considered either because this department was unaware or plainly careless. The simple alternative is to move the route eastward to the Eastern Alignment Alternative. | This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation, water quality, and alternatives selection. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |

| | | | | |
|--------|------|-----|--|--|
| | | | <p>Just some reasons to choose the Eastern Alignment Alternative:</p> <p>1)Economic Damage</p> <p>Discovery Bay as well as its surrounding communities will see a decline in day use boaters who are the ones that bring the most to our economy</p> <p>2)Public Safety</p> <p>Closing one of the busiest waterways for water sports such as skiing and wake boarding will funnel people into other areas and create a much higher risk of boat collisions and people in the water being run over by other boats</p> <p>3)Environmental Damage</p> <p>Tremendous amounts of gas will be wasted by boats having to travel further to be able to ski and wakeboard, polluting the very water these tunnels are supposed to protect</p> <p>And lets not forget the reason these tunnels are being built...SO LOS ANGELES CAN TAKE MORE WATER</p> <p>Take a look at this quote from Steve Scauzillo of the San Gabriel Valley Tribune</p> <p>"But the heaviest concentration of water users, Southern Californians, only cut their water use about 3.2 percent in November, as compared to Bay Area residents who reduced their water consumption by 18 percent for the same period."</p> <p>http://www.sgvtribune.com/environment-and-nature/20150110/northern-vs-southern-california-water-wars</p> <p>If you will not rethink the tunnels at least rethink the barge locations for the construction and CHOOSE THE EASTERN ALIGNMENT ALTERNATIVE!!</p> | |
| Cheney | Mike | 26. | <p>Please have someone that's involved in this area talk to the people that patrol the area like the Coast Guard, California Fish and Game, Contra Costa County Sheriff's Department. Any of the users of the Delta water ways that can give you a view point of how this proposed work will affect the area involved prior to implementing a plan that would be so harmful to our communities and some of our livelihoods. Please reach out to the communities and talk over the options to see what would be</p> | <p>This comment is about socioeconomic impacts This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--------|-------|-----|---|---|
| Cheney | Perry | 27. | <p>the best and least impactful process for everyone involved.</p> <p>I have just caught wind of a plan to block off Twin Sloughs, or North Victoria and Woodward Canals. It seems the state does not take into consideration that this is one of the most well traveled waterways in all of the California Delta. Right next to this planned construction zone lies Discovery Bay, a town with over 2,000 waterfront homes that on average have at least two watercraft per house. We are talking at minimum 5,000 watercraft that are permanently held here. Not to mention the 1,000 or so in dry-storage at the Discovery bay Marina, or the 500 boats that are docked in the water, AND the approximately 250 watercraft that launch from here on any given summer weekend day. I can't speak for everyone else, but over the course of a year, I personally pass through and use the waterway you are trying to block off at least 30 times. With this plan set to take 11 years (I can't remember the last public work project that finished on time) that is over 300 times I personally will be affected by this project. This is absurd that this plan was even considered either because this department was unaware or plainly careless. The simple alternative is to move the route eastward to the Eastern Alignment Alternative.</p> <p>Just some reasons to choose the Eastern Alignment Alternative:</p> <p>1)Economic Damage Discovery Bay as well as its surrounding communities will see a decline in day use boaters who are the ones that bring the most to our economy</p> <p>2)Public Safety Closing one of the busiest waterways for water sports such as skiing and wake boarding will funnel people into other areas and create a much higher risk of boat collisions and people in the water being run over by other boats</p> <p>3)Environmental Damage Lets say someone wants to go to the restaurant Union Point from Discovery Bay, a nearly weekly trip for my family and friends. It currently takes about 30 minutes by boat and about 5 gallons of fuel in a regular sized ski boat. With the proposed plan that new trip will easily take 45-50 minutes and nearly double the gas usage because the new route will go through much rougher and windier areas, let alone the unforeseen impact of increased traffic in Victoria Canal. So simple math, say on a given weekend 100 people take this trip. Thats 500 gallons of gas, wasted in one weekend. We usually get at least 20 nice weekends a year, not including holidays. So right there is 10,000 gallons of extra gas being burned in the water that this tunnel system is supposedly trying to protect.</p> | <p>This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation and alternatives selection. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
|--------|-------|-----|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---------|---------|-----|--|---|
| | | | <p>And lets not forget the reason these tunnels are being built... SO LOS ANGELES CAN TAKE MORE WATER Take a look at this quote from Steve Scauzillo of the San Gabriel Valley Tribune "But the heaviest concentration of water users, Southern Californians, only cut their water use about 3.2 percent in November, as compared to Bay Area residents who reduced their water consumption by 18 percent for the same period."</p> <p>http://www.sgvtribune.com/environment-and-nature/20150110/northern-vs-southerncalifornia-water-wars</p> <p>If you will not rethink the tunnels at least rethink the barge locations for the construction and CHOOSE THE EASTERN ALIGNMENT ALTERNATIVE!!</p> | |
| Coats | Ed | 28. | <p>It is my hope that you will extend the comment period to 90 days. What is the hurry? The state does not seem to be in a hurry to build more reservoirs although bond \$ approved to do so. I am a native, lived her all my life. I do not wish to see the Delta destroyed and another Owens Valley Created.</p> | <p>This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| Corallo | Janeane | 29. | <p>I am a resident of Discovery Bay and have been for 20 years. The access to the "North Victoria Canal" and the "Woodward Canal" would severely impact the economy and quality of life of the Town of Discovery Bay. These two waterways, would be blocked by the plan, and Old River would be made into 5 mile an hour zone. This would destroy the recreational water use in the area. This area is vital to attracting visitors as well as to the ability to use the waterways that most residents moved here for. This plan would not only effect "tourist" dollars in the summer, but also our home values, as demand will plummet if the draw of convenient access to the delta eliminated by this plan.</p> <p>The proposed "mitigation plan," is that there are other similar sloughs in the Delta. Specifically, at Brannan Island. Which entails driving a boat all the way to the North side of the San Joaquin river and to use the Sacramento River. This is far to long of a boat drive to attract visitors or home buyers.</p> <p>Rep. Garamendi and others have proposed a portfolio of solutions, with one component being a single, smaller 3,000 CFS pipe. This would cause perhaps shorter-term impact, but would still ruin our waterways and leaving Twin Sloughs forever ruined.</p> <p>Two alternatives available would prevent disaster to my home town:</p> | <p>This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation and alternatives selection. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----------|--------|-----|--|--|
| | | | <p>1. The Eastern Alignment Alternative. This would be best for boaters, fish, waterfowl, and the Delta. I don't know who that route effects, but no towns or communities.</p> <p>2. AT A MINIMUM, move the barge locations around the corner on each island. That can't be so hard and saves a lot of boaters a lot of grief.</p> <p>Saving nearby recreation will help our community remain a viable boating community. Please consider using an alternative to Construction plan in Chapter 15 – Recreation of the EIR.</p> | |
| Cordova | Adolph | 30. | We are opposed to the proposed tunnels on the Delta. We enjoy the quality of life that the Delta provides and do not want anything to spoil that quality. | This comment is about socioeconomic impacts. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Cordova | Terri | 31. | It is in violation of water code 85045. We have been living here for 8 years and have grandchildren along with family members that swim in our Bay and do not want that lifestyle to be interfered with by stagnant and polluted water. | This comment is about water quality. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Cortrite | Rogeen | 32. | Please extend the time to review the Delta Tunnels information from 30 days to 90 days. Such a life changing decision needs careful and thorough examination not possible in just 30 days. | This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Cossano | Rick | 33. | <p>EIR plan will negatively impact recreational boating for skiers and fisherman.</p> <p>This plan will severely impact recreation and the economic prosperity of this Delta area by reducing number of residents and visitors willing to use waterways with the significant route blockages proposed.</p> <p>The residents of discovery Bay and surrounding towns object to this plan and recommend the following alternatives:</p> <p>There are simple alternatives that would save recreation near Discovery Bay regardless of what size pipe they decide to run:</p> <p>1. Pick their Eastern Alignment Alternative. This would be best for boaters, fish, waterfowl, and the Delta. I don't know who that route effects, but no towns or communities. There is nothing in the EIR "Alternatives Considered"</p> | This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation and alternatives selection. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |

| | | | | |
|----------|-------|-----|---|--|
| | | | <p>documentation that I can find that considers the impact on people related to their considered alternatives.</p> <p>2. AT A MINIMUM, move the barge locations around the corner on each island. That can't be so hard and saves a lot of boaters a lot of grief. Saving nearby recreation will help our community remain a viable boating community.</p> | |
| Cram | Joe | 34. | <p>The Delta is the most valuable asset in the San Joaquin region. Do not destroy it.</p> <p>I own a waterfront home in Discovery Bay. Boating and Golf are the two primary drivers for people to live in the Town of Discovery Bay. The Delta is a massive attraction that brings in people for recreation in from all over northern California. I'm not a golfer, so my sole reason for being in Discovery Bay is the Delta.</p> <p>It must be understood that any construction plan that affects boat traffic on Old River, Middle River, or the sloughs that connect them (such as Railroad, Twin, Victoria, etc) between APRIL 15 and OCT 15 would be devastating to the local economy. A restricted waterway would negatively affect the value of my home on a massive and unrecoverable scale. Many boats have limited range so alternate paths that take boaters several miles out of their way may not be feasible. Valuable/Historic restaurants and marinas could see unrecoverable losses.</p> <p>If you would like to discuss what recreational boating means on a deeper scale, feel free to contact me via my information below.</p> | This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Crow | James | 35. | Please extend the comment period to at least 90 days. | This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Cutting | Kathy | 36. | Please extend the comment period for the WaterFix EIR at least 90 days. I will need some time to review the 2013 and 2015 comments/responses before commenting on this final EIR version. | This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| da Silva | Peggy | 37. | I received a notice about the EIR. I am very opposed to any plan that will take more water from our delta and move it to Central Valley agriculture or to southern California. This is not a sustainable solution to our water needs. Your notice mentions "new water conveyance facilities" and three "new diversion points." I say NO. We need to support sustainable agriculture, population control, and water conservation, not try to build something to move water from its | This comment is about alternatives selection. The comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S. |

| | | | | |
|-------------|---------|-----|---|--|
| | | | natural courses. | |
| Daly | Barbara | 38. | Re: BDCP/WaterFix Final EIR/EIS Comments due 1/30/17 Please provide me with an actual address where I can take my comments and drop them off instead of email. | This comment is requesting a physical address to submit comments. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Damion | Barbara | 39. | I have heard about your responses to people sending comments to the Ca. WaterFix by referring them to "Master Response 24." I agree with those I have spoken to that that response from your department is wholly inadequate. DWR's response "Master Response 24" is completely wrong that the WaterFix is complying with the Delta Reform Act requirements to protect the Delta as a Place. Destroying unique cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of the Delta which would violate Water Code 85045 and the Delta Plan itself, cannot be considered complying with the Delta Reform Act requirements to protect the Delta as a Place, and your saying that it does is a gross overstatement if not outright lie. | This comment is about the Delta Reform Act and Water Code 85045. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Daniel | Rick | 40. | Please don't impact my water property by changing the water quality and ecology. | This comment is about water quality. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Davis | Carol | 41. | Extend the comment period until at LEAST 90 days!!!! | This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| de l'Etoile | Phil | 42. | What I don't understand is why opposition to this expensive and destructive project is even necessary. There's no way that once it is built, the negative impact on Northern California will increase year after year due to the political pressures from Southern California. They keep building and we keep building and in the end there is not going to be enough water to handle all of the needs of all of us. How about starting with a building moratorium, North and South. If that could possibly get done, then we can talk about sharing water. Of course that would never happen, and so more southbound water should happen now. | [Comment received after the end of 30-day NEPA review period on January 30, 2017] This comment is about water storage. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Dooley | Pamela | 43. | I am writing to plead please do not put in the Tunnels! We have lived here in Discovery Bay for 35 years. It used to be the Peripheral Canal they wanted to use to ship our water down south. It has continually been nixed because of the disastrous effect on the farmland and also the fish and local flora and fauna. It would bring salt water far inland and ruin our ecosystem. We've gotten along quite well all these years without it. Please do NOT instate this foolish plan. Thank you! | This comment is about water quality (salinity), agriculture, terrestrial and aquatic resources. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |

| | | | | |
|-----------|-----------------|-----|---|--|
| Duncan | Augustina | 44. | I just recently learned that a new comment period is open on the response to EIR. Please extend the comment period to at least 90 days to allow adequate time to review the large number of responses and new documents. A 30 day period is much to short. | This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Flebut | John and Cheryl | 45. | Living and playing in the South Delta are a family tradition for four generations. If the California water Fix (Delta Tunnel) goes through, our family tradition will end. Closing water ski areas, closing anchorage sites like Mildred Island, and blocking access to isolate the South Delta is wrong. Master response 24 is wrong. The Sacramento River is 2 hours away from our home in Discovery Bay. Do you realize the litigation that will be produced when golf courses that use the Delta water to irrigate becomes salty? Do your realize the litigation when house prices plummet in these areas? Do your truly realize the impact, protests, and litigation that will be uselessly created? The fishing and natural habitat will be compromised. You are about to wake a sleeping giant by putting in these tunnels. There must be a negotiable solution! Smaller tubes and eastern routes are examples of ways to get water to farmers and save the Delta. We are emerging from the water drought – save Californians some money: stop the tunnels and give a tax refund! Stop the tunnels and use the money for education or roads! Be a hero! On behalf of my Grandfather, my Father, and my children - PLEASE STOP THE TUNNELS! It just doesn't make sense anymore! | This comment is about recreation and alternatives selection This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Flint | Don | 46. | Given the importance of the Final California WaterFix EIR I believe it is essential that the comment period be extended to at least 90 days. I see that all of the responses to comments made as long ago as 2013 were only shared in last month. It is unfair to expect interested parties to evaluate the plan and the responses to the old comments in anything less than 90 days. It is also worth noting you the state's failure to recirculate the Draft EIR/S after it received a failing grade from USEPA has unduly served to avoid public scrutiny. Under the law you are required to fix the problems and recirculate a draft EIR for further public comment when that happens. The state's failure to adhere to this requirement should not be used to avoid a proper review time period of at least 90 days. | This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Fratus | Clark A. | 47. | Please allow us tax paying citizens at least another 90 days regarding the comment period in regards to the Delta Tunnels. Granting this request would be most appreciated. | This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Gaboudian | Lysa | 48. | The Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts would like to submit a letter in support of the 2016 BDCP Final EIR/EIS. Where should we submit this letter (electronically or by mail)? | This comment is requesting information on how to submit comments. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |

| | | | | |
|----------------|----------|-----|---|---|
| Garnett | Michelle | 49. | I just read the EIR for the twin tunnels and am shocked that it would be considered to move forward. It shows more negative impact on the environment and the delta than positive. In reality it could be far worse. Tens of thousands of people live on or around the delta, farm on the delta and have lives on the delta. Tax paying, hard working Americans who's lives and homes could be destroyed. Please take our comments and listen to them. Millions of dollars in homes and lives are at stake. | This comment is about socioeconomic impacts. The comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S. |
| Garnett | Michelle | 50. | Please extend the California Water Fix comment period to 90 days. Our delta, livelihood, home values and way of life are all being threatened. | This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Gibbs | LaVeta | 51. | Please extend the comments period for the review period on the Delta Tunnels. We need at least 90 days. | This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Gilbert-Snyder | Paul | 52. | Promptly following DWR's approval of the BDCP/WaterFix Project, please provide the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) with a copy of any and all notices of determination regarding that approval action. This request is made pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21092.2. To further the District's sustainability efforts, please provide electronic copies of all notices responsive to this request. | [Comment received after the end of 30-day NEPA review period on January 30, 2017] This comment is about notices of determination regarding approval action. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Gregerson | Anna | 53. | I am a 3 year resident of Discovery Bay. We moved out here for the beauty, the water recreation, the access to delta and Bay. The tunnels project as planned, will murder the Delta. It will completely change the water, thereby wiping out entire species of fish, waterfowl, links in the ecosystem that keep the delta and lakes alive and well. Right this minute the State, federal and local govermen's are spending billions to reverse similarly wrong headed decisions in the South and East San Francisco Bay that was filled for salt flats and industry. It will take decades to rebuild not just the bay but the life in it. Why would you ever start that disaster over again? The tunnels project is in direct violation of established laws protecting fragile area like the Delta. No, the current plan does NOT comply individually or in whole. It is not just the water. It is the farmlands and vineyards. It is the fields for the area horses, cattle, goats, ducks, geese, fish. | This comment is about water quality, terrestrial and aquatic resources, and socioeconomic impacts. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |

| | | | | |
|----------|------|-----|--|--|
| | | | <p>And as the area becomes more and more smelly like Newark and Alvisi, property values will sink. This was to be our retirement house and community. My late husband worked hard during his career at Stanford Linear Accelerator for us to be out here...in part because it is so perfect for our grandsons to enjoy....they live in Lafayette/Walnut Creek and as lovely as that is, it is very suburban. The boys live being able to full out run, swim, play, ride and more.</p> <p>Please vote no on the Tunnels plan as is.</p> | |
| Grinager | John | 54. | <p>I am a resident of Discovery Bay, and I would like to voice my displeasure and absolute opposition to the construction plans that are proposed in the California Waterfix proposal (The Plan), particularly as they apply to the impact upon the South Delta with respect to boating and marine recreation. There are significant errors and omissions in The Plan's consideration of boating and recreation on the Delta waterways, in terms of both the significance of boating and recreation there as well as the impact to key portions of the Delta that are used for boating and recreation. The analysis in the EIR is inadequate, incomplete, and flawed.</p> <p>The final EIR fails to include Mildred Island as one of the key Recreation Sites in the South Delta or to refer to it at all. Table 15-15 that lists important Recreational Sites throughout the Delta does not include Mildred Island nor Horseshoe Bend. Both should have been included and discussed in the analysis. The EIR also fails to adequately identify the actual boating need. There are probably 4,000 boat berths in Discovery Bay counting private docks and the Marina. Yet the EIR only analyzes marinas and doesn't count boats per marina. The analysis of where boats are and where they go is missing from the EIR. The Final EIR Chapter 15 - Recreation, fails to adequately analyze activity in the Delta. As a result it does not consider the economic impacts or safety implications for the South Delta communities and boaters: Discovery Bay, Bethel Island, Bullfrog Marina and other marinas where these boaters who come to Mildred Island go for supplies, fuel, or other shopping. (Anchored boats typically have another small boat, ski boat, or tender where they can get fuel and supplies during their anchor-out).</p> <p>I would propose that The Plan utilize its Eastern Alignment Alternative. Instead of going through the Delta, the only way to save it is to go around the Delta.</p> <p>I hope that additional consideration is given within The Plan to the significance of boating and recreation on the Delta and that adequate provisions are made to ensure the opportunity for those of us who</p> | <p>This comment is about recreation and alternative selection. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |

| | | | | |
|---------|---------|-----|--|--|
| | | | have enjoyed the Delta as a mecca of marine recreation for decades to continue to do so. | |
| Hall | James | 55. | Please extend the comment period 90 days. This is too important to try and rush through which seems to be your main objective instead of providing the time to equitably evaluating all the issues. | This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Hall | Linda | 56. | <p>Please extend the comment period for 90 days. You have not given adequate notification to the public and failed to respond to comments.</p> <p>In light of recent improvements in water rainfall and snowpack in the Sierras it would have been wonderful if we had storage to capture the excess water. California has failed to provide adequate water storage even when we have passed water bonds for this purpose.</p> <p>Desalination would be a better alternative to the twin tunnels which are going to be a horribly expensive way to destroy the biggest fresh water estuary on the west coast. California has been the leader in environmental responsibility. What happened ? The twin tunnels will destroy the delta as we know it today. It needs more water not less.</p> | This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period and about alternatives selection. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Hamstra | Kristen | 57. | <p>I attended the meeting at the Brentwood Library where we met with your representatives. The line was long and I took off work to go to the meeting. I was told I would hear back from someone in 48 hours, that never happened...maybe those comments were thrown in the trash, this is just an assumption since I never got a response.</p> <p>I tried to look up my comments on your website. I found the site to be difficult to navigate. Once I finally found mine and my husbands comments, they were not even correct. We are strongly opposed to this action happening. It took 3 years to even get a list compiled and you still have not done it correctly. More time is required than today to get this list correct as well as giving everyone a chance to have their voices heard. Please extend the comment period so that this can be done correctly.</p> <p>These tunnels will ruin our Delta, community, recreation and home values. Discovery Bay is a very real community where people live and play. We love our water sports but more importantly we love our peace and paradise, and you want to take that away from us. We have worked hard to have our homes here. We drive long hours to watch the sun sink into the water. There are other options then doing this.</p> <p>I believe that these other options are better options. Desalinization is one option that is better for the environment and the pocket book. Other Cities are already starting to use this method. Take a look at Carlsbad as they are installing a plant. They are looking at ways to keep</p> | This comment is about response to comments, recreation, socioeconomic impacts, and alternatives selection. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |

| | | | | |
|---------|---------|-----|--|---|
| | | | <p>California beautiful for generations. Another option I feel that has not been explored is better harnessing water runoff for the snow packs. These options should be fully explored before you install these very expensive tunnels that will cost tax payers billions and destroy the beautiful Sacramento Delta.</p> <p>I feel like this is Jerry Brown's crazy idea that will destroy California in the long run. Stop this foolish plan and let's get real.</p> | |
| Hancock | Rise | 58. | <p>I urge you to consider other alternatives than the current proposed EIS/EIR. It is difficult to understand how every proposal is planned in the heart of a community, or a heavily used portion of he Delta. At least consider that what you see on a map is only the topographical area, it does not reflect the life that exists there. I would urge you to talk with the residents of the delta and you would hopefully gain a more educated perspective and motivation to consider other options.</p> | <p>This comment is about alternatives selection. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| Harbert | Michael | 59. | <p>I need more time for the comment period. Please extend it 90-180 days. Thank you.</p> | <p>This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| Harbert | Michael | 60. | <p>We do not want these tunnels built that are intended to supply souther California more water. By doing this it will destroy the wildlife habitat and ruin all the recreational water activities. There are other solutions the state can come up with like water storage pipelines from Oregon,Washington. This has become a political agenda.</p> | <p>This comment is about recreation and alternatives selection. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| Harbert | Mike | 61. | <p>The Tunnels project violates the Delta Reform Act and the Delta Plan, because projects in the Delta are supposed to achieve their objectives in "a manner that protects and enhances the unique cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of the Delta as an evolving place." That is California Water Code § 85045. So we don't want the tunnels!!!!</p> | <p>This comment is about the Delta Reform Act This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| Harris | Carey | 62. | <p>Hello, this email is a request to extend the comment period for the delta tunnels. We've waited 3 years to post our 2013 comments and now are given only 30 days to review the responses. Will you consider lengthening it to 90 days?</p> | <p>This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| Headd | Chris | 63. | <p>I do NOT want tunnels in the delta!</p> | <p>This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| Hearne | Thom | 64. | <p>Please reconsider the scope of your EIR as it leaves out significant considerations of important issues like impacts to Discovery Bay, Recreational boating etc. that were noted in previous reports and not addressed in the final EIR. Did you forget?</p> | <p>This comment is about recreation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |

| | | | | |
|------------|---------|-----|--|---|
| Immekeppel | Marie | 65. | <p>Please extend the review time to 90 days. As it is, the 30-day period allocated is insufficient to allow review of the EIR, let alone the thousands of comments and the agency's responses to them.</p> <p>This is too complex a matter to be dealt with so briefly.</p> | <p>This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| Item | Heather | 66. | <p>I am outraged that the EIR does not even consider Discovery Bay and the economical impact the tunnels will have. Thousands of boaters flock to the delta all summer to water ski, wake board, and boat to the local waterfront restaurants. They launch at either Discovery Bay Marina or Orowood Marina and ski down twin sloughs or south on old river. Over 4,000 boats come from residences and those stored at the Discovery Bay Marina. Thousands more come from the Bay Area to launch at either Orowood or Discovery Bay for the day.</p> <p>TWIN SLOUGHS: Do you people have any clue? This is one of the safest places to ski due to the fact that large fast performance boats do not use this slough. Would you want your child skiing next to a formula boat? NO! The bridge in the graphic below cuts twin sloughs in half! That means as soon as I get my skier up out of the water they will have to drop immediately due to the bridge. Most skiers/boarders will start at one end and either ski to the far end (or if they are young and strong) they will do the entire length and circle back. Closing this slough for 11 years will kill my property values because there won't be access to close ski runs. This also kills easy access to Union Point restaurant by water thereby impacting their summer revenue. No one is going to want to launch at either Discovery Bay or Orowood because there won't be anywhere to ski nearby! You can't expect tourists or locals to boat for 1 1/2 hours to get to the locations you suggest in your report to begin a ski run! And if they did, they would barely have enough gas to get back to the dock after one or two runs!</p> <p>SOUTH ON OLD RIVER: The report also shows that access south of twin sloughs on old river will be cut off periodically over the 11 year construction period. That will block residence of King's Island from reaching their homes. This is also the only area left close to Discovery Bay where tourists and residents would be able to ski without stopping for bridges. This also cuts off the much longer back way to Union Point restaurant (which is not on your radar because they don't have a launch ramp). Seriously I am almost 50 and will be too old to ski by the time the sloughs are opened back up!</p> <p>MILDRED: The west side of Mildred Island is one of the farthest sloughs used by those who launch from Discover bay or Orowood, but more used by those who launch at Sugar Barge. By cutting off the west side of Mildred island you are forcing all the boaters into a much smaller</p> | <p>This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation and alternatives selection. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----------|---------|-----|--|---|
| | | | <p>area there by removing any safe ski areas due to traffic.</p> <p>DISTANCE: Just for reference, it takes about an hour to get from Discovery Bay to Mandaville Island by boat (ski/wake board boat... not pontoon... that takes a lot longer). The suggestion in the plan was to send all the boaters to San Joaquin river - that is two hours away for some boats and filled with not only formula boats but full size cargo ships! How on earth is that supposed to be sold to us as safe or convenient?</p> <p>BOATING LIVES MATTER! DISCOVERY BAY MATTERS! Why is there nothing in the alternatives section? By constructing these tunnels as planned you will be wiping out the economy THE ONLY ECONOMY in Discovery Bay. THAT'S THE ONLY INDUSTRY HERE... BOATING TOURISM!!!!!! I purchased my home here because it was one of the few places the state couldn't ruin. Wrong. A friend of mine had a house on Lake Anderson in California. He had a dock and kept his boats at the local marina, purchased his fuel and fishing bait from the local store at he marina. The State of CA came through, wiped out the marina, bulldozed the store, scrapped all the residence's docks, and proceeded to build their own launch ramp as the only monopolized access to the lake. Why does governor Brown hate boaters? What happened to him? No matter what logic we show you people you simply laugh and proceed with the carnage of the delta. Perhaps a less mature response filled with the emotional outrage we really feel is the only thing you will listen to.</p> <p>So when you tank my property values what are you going to do for me? Where do you live? What if some greedy corporations persuaded the State government to ruin your neighborhood? How would you feel? My children were born here - they won't even be out of Junior High before you ruin this area! My son races jet skis and will no longer be able to practice after school because by the time we get to a launch site it will be dark! Several of our friends on Kings Island are professional wake surfers, and water skiers. What are you going to do for them when you ruin their careers?</p> | |
| Jantzen | Marc | 67. | The San Joaquin/Sacramento Delta needs to be saved for all to use. This includes boaters as well as those that need the water for drinking and agriculture. Your plans call for destroying the beauty of the natural water ways. They Delta needs to be saved for everyone to use and enjoy. | [Comment received after the end of 30-day NEPA review period on January 30, 2017] This comment is about recreation, water quality, and agriculture. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Klooster | Brettin | 68. | I am writing to express my rage at what is planned for our California Delta. This project will affect all of us and is TOTALLY unnecessary. It | This comment is about socioeconomic impacts and alternatives selection. This comment does not raise any substantive new |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------|-----|---|---|
| | | | <p>will adversely affect our property values in the delta area and the quality of our water. And it is just NOT NEEDED. Please do not accept this project. There is a better way.</p> <p>Desalinization has been perfected and the costs reduced substantially. Saudi Arabia perfected this process and now use sea water for over 23% of their water needs. This stopped the drought for Saudi Arabia. We can do the same. The technology is here and it will be MUCH CHEAPER and better for the environment, our communities, and our state. Please stop this foolish project that has been designed to put tax dollars in politicians buddies pockets. Look at Carlsbad. They are installing their own desalinization plant for their community. They now have plenty of water and will never go dry. The ocean provides more water than any coast line community will ever need. Please consider this and stop killing our community, recreation, and home values. Please consider to abolish this foolish project.</p> | environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Klooster | Brettin | 69. | As you know, giving people only a few days to comment on something of this magnitude is not right. Please extend the amount of time to comment on something that WILL affect our way of life. This project must be reconsidered as it will affect everyone in delta area and affect our property values poorly in Discovery Bay. | This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. The comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S |
| Kutchie | Mike | 70. | You dont realize what your destroying, take a step back and think to when you were 12 and the number one excitement you had was to go boating with your dad or friends or cousins. Think about that, rather than money. | This comment is about recreation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Lagorio | Lisa | 71. | <p>I am writing as a homeowner and avid user of the Delta Waterways for recreation. I am urging you to consider alternate plans as outlined below. The current plans will be extremely detrimental to the economy and community of Discovery Bay. The economy of Discovery Bay will be greatly impacted by these plans as boating recreation is the staple of our community. There are over 2,300 waterfront homes in Discovery Bay that each have boat slips (most have even more than one). The recreational boaters need continuous sloughs where they can go up to 30 MPH, not barges all over to go 5 MPH around. I object!</p> <p>Pick the Eastern Alignment Alternative. This would be best for boaters, fish, waterfowl, and the Delta. This route does not affect any towns or communities. There is nothing in the EIR "Alternatives Considered" documentation that considers the impact on people related to your considered alternatives.</p> <p>AT A MINIMUM, move the barge locations around the corner on each island. Saving nearby recreation will help our community remain a viable boating community.</p> | This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation and alternatives selection. The comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Leininger | Natalie | 72. | I am writing as a homeowner and avid user of the Delta Waterways for recreation. I am urging you to consider alternate plans as outlined | This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation and alternatives selection. The comment does not raise any substantive |

| | | | | |
|---------|---------|-----|--|--|
| | | | <p>below. The current plans will be extremely detrimental to the economy and community of Discovery Bay. The economy of Discovery Bay will be greatly impacted by these plans as boating recreation is the staple of our community. There are over 2,300 waterfront homes in Discovery Bay that each have boat slips (most have even more than one). The recreational boaters need continuous sloughs where they can go up to 30 MPH, not barges all over to go 5 MPH around. I object!</p> <p>1. Pick the Eastern Alignment Alternative. This would be best for boaters, fish, waterfowl, and the Delta. This route does not affect any towns or communities. There is nothing in the EIR "Alternatives Considered" documentation that considers the impact on people related to your considered alternatives.</p> <p>2. AT A MINIMUM, move the barge locations around the corner on each island. Saving nearby recreation will help our community remain a viable boating community.</p> | new information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/ |
| Long | Robbie | 73. | this is a bad plan and needs more EIR review. Alternate plans need to be discussed. | This comment is about alternatives selection. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Lopes | Shirley | 74. | Please make the response I've 90 not 30 days for the Delta tunnel issue. | This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Ludwig | Susan | 75. | Extend the comment period to a minimum of 90 days due to the failure to respond to the comments, and failure to consider the alternatives. | This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Marples | Michael | 76. | <p>I am writing this email because I am highly concerned with your plans to change the recreational Twin Sloughs in Discovery Bay. I grew up in this town and have lived here my entire life.</p> <p>Twin Sloughs is important to the people of Discovery Bay. It's the number one and go to spot for people to visit and enjoy the delta. It's where I take anyone who is visiting on a boat ride to. It's a place where kids and adults alike choose to enjoy their summer on the water and your plans will take that away.</p> <p>Twin Sloughs is popular because of its location and because of the safety it provides. Reefs growing down the middle of the channel</p> | This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |

| | | | | |
|----------|--------|-----|---|---|
| | | | <p>provide a natural barrier splitting an already wide channel into two lanes. An ideal location and situation for people who want to tube, ski, fish, etc..</p> <p>That slough may not seem like much, but in reality it's why a lot of people choose to live in Discovery Bay. I ask that you please reconsider your plans to change Twin Sloughs, and relocate your barge facilities to an area that won't affect people in such a traumatic way.</p> | |
| Martinez | Angela | 77. | <p>Please extend the comment period for comments.</p> <p>The Delta Tunnels are BAD for the Delta. They are bad for homeowners, they are bad for recreation, they are bad for the economic my, they are BD, Bad, Bad!!!</p> | <p>This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| McCleery | Jan | 78. | <p>Many of the responses to my comments sent in 2013 and in 2015 refer to another form or master response letter for the response. I was unable to find out where this master letter was until a few days ago, January 25th. Shay Humphrey, ICF, has been very helpful (see email thread below).</p> <p>So naturally, we need more time to review the new 350 page file which has no table of contents, but contains the formal responses to many comments. Others I have talked to also did not understand responses about master letters or how to find them.</p> <p>Please extend the comment period since we have new information provided that supposedly will answer our 2013 and 2015 concerns.</p> <p>In addition, I found out last week that our Town of Discovery Bay has not yet had time to put together their input, and this project will have a huge impact on our town's economy.</p> <p>The public deserves adequate time to review responses to comments made years ago and only recently posted or responded to, especially when responses contain references to other forms and master letters that are difficult to find. In addition, I thought the EIR was being reorganized, but still each subject references another chapter (like Chapter 16 on Socioeconomic issues that references to Chapter 15 Recreation) and every chapter interlaces information about all of the many alternatives. It is extremely confusing. Reviewing over 90,000 pages is extraordinarily time consuming for the public.</p> <p>This project will have significant impact on our lives. Please give our town more time to formally respond. Please extend the comment period.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> | <p>This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| McCleery | Jan | 79. | <p>Most of my comments were not truly considered. Many of the official responses to my comments were invalid, misleading, or inaccurate. In</p> | <p>The comment is introducing Jan McCleery and does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not</p> |

| | | | | |
|----------|-----|-----|--|---|
| | | | <p>addition, comments submitted in person at BDCP meetings (even verbally with written backup) or in the less formal In-Delta meetings were not included or addressed. And a promise made by Dr. Jerry Meral when he was head of the BDCP has not been fulfilled. I will provide more detail in my new comments below.</p> <p>Because of these failures, the Final EIR fails to address major issues or even acknowledge the issues credibly. Since the EIR fails to acknowledge the impacts, there has been no attempt for corrective action.</p> | previously addressed in the Final EIR/S. |
| McCleery | Jan | 80. | <p>Comment 1: The EIR fails to consider the impact to Discovery Bay's economy and way of life</p> <p>The EIR fails to address the significant impact to Discovery Bay from any of the through-Delta alternatives including the preferred Alternative 4A construction plan. Even worse, the Alternative 9 plan would result in unrecoverable economic impact to the South Delta.</p> <p>That is because the EIR fails to identify the community of Discovery Bay as a boating and recreation community. The EIR only references Discovery Bay in the list of other communities in the Delta region, like Brentwood, Knightsen, etc. However, unlike any other Delta community, there are 2,300 homes in Discovery Bay on the water, each with an average of two boat births, in addition to the large marina. That adds up to almost 5,000 boat berths for Discovery Bay alone.</p> <p>Discovery Bay waterfront properties are today worth \$300K each more than similar non-waterfront properties. The Chapter 16 analysis should include, for Discovery Bay, the percent of its economy that is boating-related and, since significant, some steps should have been included and analyzed to reduce the effect of the plan's impact on our economy. This is a failure in the analysis of the plan.</p> <p>Instead, mitigation should include the \$700 million dollars lost by owners of waterfront homes in Discovery Bay when their home values drop because of this project and property values Discovery Bay will lose over time. That only includes the loss of extra value of waterfront homes. The total economic impact to the town is much higher. The EIR failed to analyze the economic impact.</p> <p>This information was provided in 2013 Comment Letter 1808(1). The official response said to review Chapter 15 Recreation and Master Response 24. But Chapter 15 Recreation fails to identify the number of waterfront homes, the value, where the boats are and where they go. The chapter on recreation fails to identify the important recreation sites (Table 15-15) although in comments written and verbal, the need</p> | Impacts to Discovery Bay as described by the commenter are speculative and not within the analysis of CEQA. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |

| | | | | |
|----------|-----|-----|--|--|
| | | | <p>to have local recreation sloughs open and available for water sports (e.g. "Twin Sloughs", called "Woodward Canal" in the EIR) and the need for the nearby anchorage (Mildred Island) to remain peaceful and usable.</p> <p>Analyzing the latest version of Chapter 15, Recreation, there are tables identifying the marinas in each county:</p> <p>Under the legal framework of CEQA and NEPA, the Final EIR/EIS fails to address the significant impacts on the 14,000 person community of Discovery Bay and on the 2,300 water-front homes from either an economic or cultural perspective. The impact on recreation and boating is significant and that, in turn, affects our economy and culture.</p> <p>The response to my comment was to also refer to Master Response 24 concerning the Delta as a Plan. See Comment 12 for why Master Response 24 is false.</p> <p>This is a failing the public trust and is an inverse condemnation of the community of Discovery Bay.</p> | |
| McCleery | Jan | 81. | <p>Comment 2: Impacting Recreation (separate from "Boating")</p> <p>Chapter 15 - Recreation fails to do even a basic analysis of what the requirements are for recreational areas to be adequate for waterskiing, wakeboarding, and similar activities. Because of that failure, the construction plan is to put two barge/dock sites in what the locals call "Twin Sloughs" (which officially on maps are two sloughs in parallel: "Woodward Canal" and "North Victoria Canal." The EIR labels both together as "Woodward Canal"). Other recreation favorites include Victoria Canal, which some alternatives would destroy and remove access to.</p> <p>Having nearby recreational sloughs is key to Discovery Bay's status as an ideal boating and recreation area. The location of these construction sites cuts off two thirds of the waterski/wakeboard area that is the closest to Discovery Bay. Having these recreation sloughs at our doorstep is key for our "ski in/ski out" home value. This is an economic issue and a "way of life" issue.</p> <p>This was pointed out in comments but not correctly responded to and basically ignored. This impact is not adequately analyzed in the EIR and could be avoided.</p> <p>As stated above, the EIR failed to properly identify the number of boats in the South Delta. This may explain why the plan has not made any</p> | <p>The commenter raises concerns with the recreation analysis and the impact to Discovery Bay's access to water recreation areas. The commenter also disagrees with the Final EIR/EIS' identification of recreation areas and would like Woodward Canal and nearby sloughs such as Victoria Canal to be included in Table 15-15 which lists recreational sites in the Delta.</p> <p>As stated in multiple responses to comments on the Recirculated Draft EIR/EIS, the proposed project aims to allow the federal and State water projects to deliver more reliable water supplies, in a way less harmful to fish. Recreation would be impacted because of the proposed project. Waterways such as Victoria and Woodward Canals under Alternative 4A would be opened to recreationists and water skiers once construction is complete. The proposed project would include environmental commitments and mitigation measures to reduce impacts, as described in Impact Rec-3.</p> <p>As explained in response to comment 2760-3in Volume 2, Final EIR/EIS, a methodology was used in Chapter 15 to determine well-established recreation sites entailed using GIS data layers from DWR, California Protected Areas Data Portal, Green Info Network, USFWS, and Recreation areas developed from AECOM and ICF.</p> <p>This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final</p> |

| | | | | |
|----------|-----|-----|--|--|
| | | | <p>attempt to consider less impactful alignments (e.g., the Eastern Alignment, but altered to preserve Delta waterways for recreation) or at a minimum, trying to locate Alternative 4A construction sites in such a way as to maximize and preserve recreation opportunities.</p> <p>My comments on this concern were not adequately responded to and the responses were at times misleading.</p> <p>I also commented on this in 2016, comment # 1970-1. I let DWR know that what's missing is recognition of the impact on recreation from the barge/dock location on the "Twin Sloughs" near Discovery Bay.</p> <p>Table 15-15 (Alternative 4, 4A) listing Recreational Sites does not include Woodward Canal (i.e., Twin Sloughs) or other nearby sloughs such as Victoria Canal. The EIR cannot claim it has analyzed the impact to recreational sites if it fails to even find out what makes them important, where they are, and list them. The public has repeatedly explained to DWR representatives what the key sites are.</p> <p>The EIR recognizes that putting the barge dock facilities on Twin Sloughs is a huge concern, but left them there anyway.</p> | EIR/EIS. |
| McCleery | Jan | 82. | <p>The "Mitigation" in the EIR is unreasonable. Of the alternate sloughs listed, Victoria, Empire Cut and Bishop Cut, only Victoria is close enough and it already is in-use. That is not a mitigation for closing nearby sloughs. Having everyone go Victoria Canal on busy weekends in addition to the users that now use it from Discovery Bay and from Tracy Oasis will overcrowd it and cause accidents. Empire Cut is further away and short, thus not a mitigation. Bishop cut is across the main channel. Whoever wrote that it and that recreation in other further places is "mitigation" has no clue about distances or the Delta waterways. It appears they just looked for straight sloughs rather than understand what recreational boaters need and where recreational boaters are. Again, this points to a failure in Chapter 15 to do due diligence on where the recreational boaters are.</p> <p>The "mitigation" about improved recreation elsewhere, i.e. for Discovery Bay skiers to go ski at Brannan Island or other remote-from-DB areas is totally impractical.</p> <p>Many or most of the waterski/wakeboard boats in Discovery Bay either do not have trailers (they are kept full-time on the water or are in the Marina's stackable area and launched at the DB Marina by tractors) or the citizens don't have vehicles to tow a boat. DB is a ski-in</p> | <p>The commenter's concerns with feasibility of mitigation for Discovery Bay residents are speculative and are not related to the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/S.</p> <p>This comment does not raise any new issues that weren't addressed in the Final EIR/S.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----------|-----|-----|---|--|
| | | | <p>location/city. The distance by water to the other places is too far away to be considered viable for DB to be considered a boating area, especially for our teens, for before/after work or school, or other timeframes where being close to the ski runs is a reason for buying a home in Discovery Bay.</p> <p>Instead, homes and the marina will be unattractive and boaters from elsewhere will store their boats in other parts of the Delta, closer to recreation areas. That will be a huge hit on Discovery Bay's economy.</p> | |
| McCleery | Jan | 83. | <p>I had commented that "The EIR shows construction blocking favorite nearby waterski channels and 'mitigation' is for boaters to use waterways far away. "The response to my comment was that waterways will be "navigable" and barges "temporary." This response was incorrect and misleading when actually:</p> <p>The EIR states that "Accounting for the potential for both barge facilities to be built and in operation at the same time, the barge facilities and barge operations at this location would occupy the entire or nearly the entire canal, constricting or preventing boat passage." Therefore the response that waterways will be "navigable" was incorrect.</p> <p>The EIR states that this area (Twin Sloughs) will be closed eleven years. The response that it is "temporary" is misleading and inaccurate. A temporary closure of a waterway means a short duration - hours or at most months. Elsewhere in the EIR, they claim "temporary" is two years or less. The response that an eleven year closure is temporary is completely false.</p> <p>Sloughs that are valuable for wakeboarding and waterskiing require boats to travel at speeds much higher than 5 MPH (else the skier/wakeboarder gets dropped). They must also be able to maintain that speed for a long time else the skier/wakeboarder needs to stop and start, so is not a place they would use.</p> <p>Skiers/wakeboarders need a fairly long distance/run to ski/wakeboard. The EIR only analyzes navigation and talks about routes where there are barges and such will be "open". Those areas will be 5 MPH. For recreational use, those sloughs and waterways are virtually "closed." This lack of understanding about recreational requirements in the analysis showing a complete lack of research and due diligence.</p> <p>The Final EIR lists the impact to recreation as "Significant and Unavoidable." That it is unavoidable is false. There are multiple ways to avoid the impact which have not been analyzed or considered, even though this issue has been raised multiple times.</p> | <p>There would be no permanent closure of Twin Sloughs, and while there is a potential for the barge facilities and operations to block the canal, this would also be temporary. As identified in the EIR/EIS this impact to recreation is significant and unavoidable. As discussed in response to Comment 1970-4 on the Draft EIR/EIS in Volume 2, Final EIR/EIS, there will be temporary and unavoidable impacts to recreation.</p> <p>The commenter presents alternative alignments of the projects. While the input is appreciated, as captured in responses to comments (Comment 2760-6 in Volume 2, Final EIR/EIS) on the Recirculated Draft EIR/EIS the alternatives included in the EIR/EIS represent a legally adequate reasonable range of alternatives and the scope of the analysis of alternatives fully complies with both CEQA and NEPA. The specific proposals that were considered but ultimately rejected by the Lead Agencies are discussed in EIR/EIS Appendix 3A, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1. Appendix 3A thoroughly explains why various proposals were not analyzed in the EIR/EIS. In addition, Master Response 4 in Volume 2, Final EIR/EIS, provides an overview of the alternatives development and screening process.</p> <p>This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |

Figure 2. Barge/dock locations blocking Twin Sloughs (and potentially Middle River) (either slightly moving tunnel path or building roads to the shaft construction area.)

ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS: There are three ways to solve the “Twin Sloughs” problem besides the No Alternative alternative (which is of course my preferred):

(1) Reject the Through-Delta Alignment. From a boating and recreation standpoint, the Eastern Alignment moves the construction area out of the

Delta entirely except for Victoria Canal.

i. If the Eastern Alignment were a tunnel, that would preserve valuable farmland and recreational sloughs by going under Victoria Canal and allowing access to Grant Line.

ii. Or if it is a canal instead of a tunnel, the last stage needs to protect the recreational sloughs in the far South: Victoria Canal and Grant Line.

(2) Modify the alignment to go around the South Delta, as far east as possible from Mildred Island and from the Middle River boating waterways, with the same changes as in (1) above. Altering the tunnel route is an option. Jerry

Meral altered the tunnel route to go around the Sand Hill Crane sanctuary and the farmer’s Victorian home (as he should have).

Discovery Bay deserves the same consideration.

(3) Moving the barge locations from the current plan in Figure 2 above to more

acceptable locations as shown in Figure 3 below:

Figure 3: Proposed revision to barge/dock locations to maintain recreational access.

The response given by the DWR to my 2013 comment # 1970-1 stated: “Barge routes and landing sites will be selected by the construction contractor

and will be expected to comply with the following criteria:

Maintain minimum waterway width greater than 100 feet (assuming maximum barge width of 50 feet)

Use of existing barge landings where possible

The current selection of two barge/dock sites on Twin Sloughs does not maintain the minimum waterway feet nor use an existing barge landing (the ferry crossing landing could be leveraged).

Assuming that is true, then moving the barge locations to the positions shown in Figure 3 better meets the landing site criteria, because there is an existing ferry dock. Whereas the current locations do not. The

| | | | | |
|----------|-----|-----|---|---|
| | | | <p>Middle River location on Victoria Island is wide enough that, for the most part, the waterways could still be navigable and potentially skiable.</p> <p>If the Victoria Island barge location were on Middle River, there is a wide area there so boat traffic wouldn't even be disturbed. Recreation could continue across Twin Sloughs and down Middle River.</p> <p>These small changes in barge/dock locations would leave most of the DB recreational sloughs open and available and this avoid the significant economic impact that otherwise will occur to the community of DB in the short-term during the 11-year construction project.</p> <p>Failing to adequately consider the Eastern Alignment or even moving barge/dock sites out of main waterways is irresponsible and fails to meet the public trust.</p> | |
| McCleery | Jan | 84. | <p>(*) Restoring the Slough: Another problem with putting the barge docks on Twin Sloughs is that the response to my 2013 comment 1970-4 included, "Waterways such as Victoria and Woodward Canals under Alternative 4 would be opened to recreationists and waterskiers once construction is complete." That matches that the EIR claims sloughs will be restored. For the Twin Sloughs, that would mean restoring the center slough with a partial berm and tules to the same state that it was before the project occurred, else it will not be restored as the ideal waterski/wakeboard slough that it is now and will be forever ruined. I have not seen that restoration project specifically listed in the EIR. Does the DWR commit to fulfilling this promise?</p> | <p>Mitigation Measure AES-1d, Restore Barge Unloading Facility Sites Once Decommissioned, will minimize the impact on visual quality and character at barge facility sites.</p> <p>This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| McCleery | Jan | 85. | <p>Comment 3: Mildred Island Anchorage Important for South Delta Boaters and Visitors to the Delta</p> <p>Even after I identified Mildred Island as the important primary anchorage for the entire South Delta region (the area that falls within Contra Costa County), in my comments in 2013, 2015, in person in Sacramento and at the In-Delta meeting in Brentwood, the Final EIR still fails to include Mildred Island as one of the key Recreation Sites in the South Delta or to refer to it at all. That is true not only for Discovery Bay, but also the many marinas that surround Bethel Island.</p> <p>Mildred Island is where most boats anchor in the South Delta. Most boats come from the near surrounding areas (Bethel Island, Oakley, and Discovery Bay) but others come from San Francisco, Benicia, Stockton, etc. It is a well-known anchorage. On Labor Day, the SeaRay club brings about 60 or more boats and form a complete circle - and engineering feat. The Grand Banks club, Bayliner club, Discovery Bay</p> | <p>The BDCP/California WaterFix has undergone many iterations since 2013. The commenter is correct that construction is planned near Mildred island on the eastern side of Bacon Island. The mitigation measures and environmental commitments described in the Final EIR/EIS and mentioned here will minimize the disruption to Mildred Island for the construction period.</p> <p>As stated in response to comments on the Recirculated Draft EIR/EIS 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. The specific proposals that were considered but ultimately rejected by the Lead Agencies are discussed in Appendix 3A of the DEIR/EIS, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1. Appendix 3A thoroughly explains why various</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>Yacht as well as other groups and clubs use the Mildred Island anchorage. In addition small groups or single boat anchor at Mildred Island for a weekend or week or more. No other South Delta location can support these boats.</p> <p>The only other anchorage in the South Delta is what the locals call Horseshoe Bend. Horseshoe Bend can support 10-20 boats or more. Besides these two anchorages, there are only a few sloughs where one or several boats can slip in behind some tules and anchor for the night or weekend, but no other anchorage.</p> <p>Table 15-15 (Alternative 4, 4A) does not include Mildred Island nor Horseshoe Bend. Both should have been included and discussed in the analysis, primarily a discussion about what is the value of keeping boats in the Bethel Island marinas or the value of boating from Discovery Bay. Again, there are over 5,000 boat berths in Discovery Bay counting private docks and the Marina. There are 30-40 marinas on Bethel Island and a few additional marinas dotted around the South Delta. There are additional private berths on Bethel Island, behind homes in Oakley, etc. Only analyzing marinas misses counting most of the boats in the South Delta. Thus the analysis of what these boats do and where they go is missing. The EIR cannot claim it has analyzed the impact to recreational sites if it fails to even find out where they are and list them. The public has repeatedly explained to DWR representatives what the key areas are.</p> <p><i>Figure 4. Mildred Island and Horseshoe Bend Anchorages in relationship to Bethel Island and Discovery Bay</i></p> <p>The Final EIR Chapter 15 - Recreation, still fails to adequately identify main boating locations, and as a result it does not consider the economic impacts or safety implications for the South Delta communities and boaters: primarily Discovery Bay but also Bethel Island, Bullfrog Marina and other marinas where these boaters go for supplies, fuel, or other shopping. (Anchored boats typically have another small boat, ski boat, or tender where they can get supplies during their anchor-out).</p> <p>Nor does the EIR analyze the impact to marinas where boats are stored because there is a nice anchorage close enough to the marina or boat dock where the boater can go on a Friday night after work and stay the weekend. In fact, the discussion of anchorages is missing entirely from Chapter 15 and Mildred Island is not even labeled on most maps in the EIR.</p> | <p>proposals were not analyzed in the EIR/EIS</p> <p>Regarding concerns about odor of RTM, please see Master Response 12, in Volume 2, Final EIR/EIS, which discusses potential reuse of tunnel material and addresses concerns about the odor of reusable tunnel material.</p> <p>As there are other opportunities in the Delta for anchorage it is assumed that Delta visitors who find these sites unappealing will continue to use other sites in the Delta. Construction of the project will not result in significant permanent impacts to the anchorage at Mildred Island.</p> <p>As stated in the response to comments on the Recirculated Draft EIR/EIS, generally the sites determined by the methodology described in the response to comment include more formal recreation sites such as established recreation areas. Formal recreation sites may include those with designated activities and facilities. This is not an official term, but it used for these purposes to distinguish from sites which may be used for Recreation without being designated as a recreation area by the establishments used for determining recreation sites.</p> <p>This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
|--|--|---|--|

The response to my 2013 comment 1970-6 about Mildred Island being an anchorage that it was important to protect was: “No California WaterFix facilities are proposed for the area of Mildred Island anchorages, the nearest proposed barge landing site is at the north end of Bacon Island where boating access could be somewhat constrained but only on the southern side of Connection Slough. The northern portion of this waterway would not be affected. Construction activities on Bacon Island would be limited and is not expected to affect boating or other recreational activities including marinas because construction would be on islands separated from waterways by levees.”

That response is totally both inaccurate and false. As shown on the final BDCP map below, the construction site is planned to be right next to the anchorage, not what the responder told me. The map of the modified alternative shows something slightly different but is not detailed so the actual plans are unclear.

Figure 5. Construction is next to the anchorage and will obviously bring 24x7 disruption to the peaceful Mildred Island Anchorage.

The purpose of an anchorage is to go spend peaceful, tranquil evenings, watching the sunset, barbequing and enjoying scenic beauty of the Delta. Looking across at trucks, barges, hearing pounding construction, and seeing glaring nighttime lights throughout the summer months, 24x7, for eleven years will definitely destroy the use of the anchorage. The response was misleading and incorrect.

The response to my objections in the 2016 revision of the EIR, when I still didn't see Mildred listed anywhere or considered was: “The methodology used in Chapter 15 to determine well-established recreation sites ... As such, generally those include more formal recreation sites. The Delta, however, has countless informal recreation sites, which would be infeasible to track or list.”

That response was inadequate and incorrect. What are “formal sites” in the Delta?

For comparison, a paragraph is devoted to discussing what is called “The Rhode Island Wildlife Area” Which says: “It provides habitat for rivers otters, beavers, muskrats, and birds such as ducks, herons, and egrets, among others. The wildlife area is accessible only by boat and provides opportunities for fishing, wildlife viewing, and waterfowl hunting (California Department of Fish and Game 2009b; California

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>Department of Fish and Game 2011b). Though the public can access this area, no facilities are provided. “</p> <p>Rhode Island is nothing more than a small island that flooded some years ago and wasn’t reclaimed. There is absolutely no work that has been done to it by the State. Only small fishing boats can access it due to the snags and fallen trees.</p> <p>To call it a wildlife area and to ignore the larger, more accessible, Mildred Island which is equally full of wildlife and birds and is available for boaters to enjoy around-the-clock shows that the writers of Chapter 15 most likely have never been in the Delta. In the winter, the flocks of birds that are in Mildred Island are amazing. There are duck blinds the hunters use that are much more accessible than Rhode Island, and much more fishing is done in Mildred Island than Rhode Island. It’s rare we see a boat in Rhode Island. What makes Rhode Island a formal site and the popular Mildred Island ignored?</p> <p>To show how little the popular sites have been categorized, Chapter 15, Table 15-4 is missing Mildred Island, which is a more popular duck hunting area than Rhode Is.</p> <p>NOTE: On the other hand, what is the benefit to identifying either Rhode Island or Mildred Island “Wildlife Areas” if construction, 24x7 pounding and noise is happening on Bacon Island next to both of them?</p> <p>If any real outreach were conducted, or more importantly, if feedback provided were actually used and incorporated into the next version of the plan, the public would be much less frustrated. The process has not adequately reviewed public feedback or incorporated it into the plan. If that had occurred, the location of the barge docks would not be right next to the primary anchorage.</p> <p>Long-Term Impact to the Mildred Island Anchorage: Smelly muck pond (RTM) right there, just West of the anchorage. The winds blow from the west during the summer months (which is why the boats nose in towards the western shore of Mildred, closest to Bacon Island). Talk about not taking boating into consideration at all!</p> <p>What is the solution? Three possible solutions besides no tunnels at all:</p> <p>(1) Move the route to the Eastern Alignment. (see prior comment, solution (1)) (2) Modify the alignment to go around the South Delta, as far east as possible</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | |
|----------|-----|-----|---|--|
| | | | <p>(see prior comment, solution (2))</p> <p>(3) (a) Move the barge location and muck pond south next to the Bacon Island Bridge. That location is halfway between the two shaft locations. (b) In addition, build a road down the center of the island to accommodate both shaft locations and not run the heavy trucks on the levee wall day and night where they would make more noise and dust right near the anchorage. This makes sense for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Reduces the noise from traffic that otherwise would occur from trucks on the levee wall b. Reduces the view of seeing the trucks and activity 24x7 c. Reduces the wear and tear on the levee. Levee roads are not viable for accommodating that traffic level and if it floods, that would make a mess for your project. d. Removes the smelly muck from next to the popular anchorage. <p>If (3) is done, just make sure not to put any barge/docks on the south side of Bacon Island. That would be illegal as clarified in Comment 4. There are some maps that look like barges could block that sough. Illegal.</p> <p>More justification to moving the barge/dock location south next to the bridge away from the Mildred Island anchorage is in the DWR response given to my 2013 comment # 1970-1 stated: “Barge routes and landing sites will be selected by the construction contractor and will be expected to comply with the following criteria: Maintain minimum waterway width greater than 100 feet (assuming maximum barge width of 50 feet)</p> <p>The waterway near the Bacon Island Bridge is much wider than the waterway across from Mildred Island. In addition, there is a parallel slough with the operable bridge for large boat traffic.</p> <p>Moving the dock/barge location south by the road overpass is the right solution if Alternative 4A is maintained as the preferred alternative.</p> | |
| McCleery | Jan | 86. | <p>Comment 4: The EIR fails to recognize that blocking the use of either of the railroad bridges and sloughs between is illegal. Access is required to be 24x7.</p> <p>Discovery Bay and other South Delta boaters have the US Coast Guard commitment that the railroad has a bridge able to be operated 24x7, year round. The primary bridge is Orwood RR Bridge on Old River. However, if that bridge ever is inoperable, the train operator will walk</p> | <p>Please refer to Environmental Commitment: Develop and Implement a Barge Operations Plan and AMM7: Barge Operations Plan for additional information regarding navigation and barge operations in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> <p>This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----------|-----|-----|--|--|
| | | | <p>down the track to the alternate bridge on Middle River which will then be operated 24x7. That policy insures that Discovery Bay boaters are never trapped in or out of Discovery Bay. That also means the sloughs on both sides of the railroad tracks must always stay open and navigable.</p> <p>The map of the “Modified Pipeline/Tunnel Alignment (M15-4) shows the slough South of Bacon Island has brown lines. If that means barges could block that slough, that would be illegal.</p> <p>The “Operable Barriers” at the east end of that slough as proposed in Alternative 9 are also illegal.</p> | |
| McCleery | Jan | 87. | <p>Comment 5: Additional ways that Boating and Recreation in the South Delta has not been considered</p> <p>Construction is planned to be done at many sites throughout the Delta simultaneously, lengthening the time at single sites to eleven years! The alignment chosen goes through the Delta waterways instead of around them. Since fish need to be taken into consideration, construction can only occur during the boating season (not during the winter).</p> <p>Because of this shortened timeframe (boating season only), construction in the waterways is planned to occur around the clock, 24x7, thus essentially eliminating boating (anchoring out) for eleven years in the South Delta.</p> <p>The location of the construction sites takes no consideration of local boating and recreation activities. This both impacts the safety of Discovery Bay boaters and the value of boating near Discovery Bay, thus there will be a huge economic and cultural impact on our town. This also has significant impact on Bethel Island marinas and all marinas in the South Delta.</p> | <p>As stated in response to comment 2760-6 on the Recirculated Draft EIR/EIS in Volume 2, Final EIR/EIS, 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. The specific proposals that were considered but ultimately rejected are discussed in Appendix 3A of the DEIR/EIS, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1. Appendix 3A thoroughly explains why various proposals were not analyzed in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| McCleery | Jan | 88. | <p>Comment 6: Issues with Blocking Connection Slough</p> <p>One discussion that is missing from the EIR is how the safety of boaters will be impacted: how boating accidents and issues are currently responded to and the impact of this project on boater safety. This issue was documented in feedback to the USBR in 2010 concerning the “Two-Gates Fish Protection Project” where a dam/gate was going to be installed on Connection Slough. Fortunately, that project was shelved after the USBR became aware of the significant issues the gates would cause in the Delta and to Discovery Bay. That information doesn’t appear to have been utilized in the preparation of this EIR.</p> <p>The traffic and use of Connection Slough, a main thoroughfare between Bethel Island and the center of the boating activities on</p> | <p>Response to this concern is captured in Comment 1647-69 on the Draft EIR/EIS in Volume 2, Final EIR/EIS. As described in Appendix 3B, before maintenance activities begin in waterways, project proponents will ensure information regarding the maintenance of any in-water project facilities (e.g., intakes for the water conveyance facility) is posted at nearby affected Delta marinas and public launch ramps. This information will include maintenance site location(s), maintenance schedules, speed limits, and identification of no-wake zone and/or detours, where applicable. Information on detours would include site-specific details regarding any temporary partial channel closures, including contacting the U.S. Coast Guard, boating organizations, marina operators, city or county parks departments, and California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), where applicable.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----------|-----|-----|---|--|
| | | | <p>Middle River including Mildred Island, isn't noted or analyzed. Connection Slough traffic is important because marine rescue services are shared between the Bethel Island and Discovery Bay sheriff's departments. With this plan, there could be barges and blockages between Discovery Bay and Middle River boating activities.</p> <p>Mildred Island is where most boats anchor in the South Delta. Most come from the near surrounding areas (Bethel Island, Oakley, and Discovery Bay) but others come from San Francisco, Benicia, and Stockton. It is a well-known anchorage. On Labor Day, the SeaRay club brings about 60 boats and form a complete circle – and engineering feat. The Grand Banks club is often seen anchored there as well as other groups and clubs. The safety of all of these boaters will be limited if Connection Slough is closed to traffic from Bethel Island.</p> <p>In addition to supporting marine sheriffs, the Vessel Assist boats that aid boaters in peril (boats that have lost their engines or otherwise need towing assistance) is based in Bethel Island. It responds to problems in Mildred Island. No discussion is included in the analysis of the safety issues for boaters if Connection Slough is closed.</p> <p>In addition, the impact of not getting through Connection Slough means Bethel Island boaters lose being able to go conveniently to Mildred Island to anchor.</p> | <p>Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a, Trans-1b and Trans -1c were developed to address several impacts, including Impact TRANS-4, Disruption of Marine Traffic during Construction. Traffic management plans are intended to comprehensively address multiple modes, including waterborne travel.</p> <p>This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| McCleery | Jan | 89. | <p>Comment 7: Eastern Alignment should be Re-Considered</p> <p>Master Response 24 states that alternatives have been considered. I contend that the Eastern Alignment that was one of the considered alternatives was not adequately considered regarding protecting Delta communities and in the context of Delta as a Place. It would need some alteration in the south to adequately protect recreation. But overall, it is much better than going through-the-Delta.</p> <p>The Eastern Alignment should be re-considered because it:</p> <p>(1) Avoids impacting Delta fish and waterfowl since it goes around the Delta</p> <p>(2) Avoids impacting recreation and boating, which the Delta Plan states should be protected, not eliminated from a significant portion of the Delta, the South Delta.</p> <p>(3) Avoids issues related to putting a pipeline under water channels where, if the pipeline were to break and create a sinkhole and start sucking water into the tunnel, that would be bad. Or on islands where if one of the islands where</p> | <p>This comment expresses the commenter's wish for the project proponents to reconsider an Eastern alignment for the project.</p> <p>As stated in response to comments on the Recirculated Draft EIR/EIS 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. All potential alternatives that were proposed during the scoping process and during time of preparation of the Draft EIR/EIS were considered. The specific proposals that were considered but ultimately rejected by are discussed in Appendix 3A of the DEIR/EIS, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1. Appendix 3A thoroughly explains why various proposals were not analyzed in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----------|-----|-----|--|--|
| | | | <p>there a tunnel shafts is flooded in a dramatic way, like Mildred was in '82, that could easily break the shaft and flood the tunnel with water, perhaps salty water. Since there is no way to stop water inside the tunnel, no gates planned, this would be very bad.</p> <p>(4) Goes through more solid ground, less prone to shifting and settling.</p> <p>The alignment that does not significantly effect boating and recreation and does not ruin the beauty of the Delta as a Place is the Eastern alignment, because it does what should be done when trying to preserve a scenic area. The Eastern Alignment goes around the area you are trying to preserve and not through the middle of it.</p> <p>As I've said in verbal comments to the BDCP Board, "You wouldn't preserve Yosemite by putting a construction project through the middle of it!"</p> | |
| McCleery | Jan | 90. | <p>Comment 8: Lack of Transparency</p> <p>This Final EIR process is yet another in a long list of infringements DWR has made on the process of a valid public EIR review. First, 90,000 pages of verbiage, most of which is just descriptions without any following analysis or use of the information presented, must be considered by the public as a way to hide facts and make this process nontransparent. The public cannot consume and review 90,000 pages of documents.</p> <p>Because we haven't been given much time to review the responses to our comments, I have had to prepare this document quickly and that also adds to its length and perhaps some redundancy. If the comment period were reasonable, I could do a better job. But as always, both the length of the EIR and unreasonably short comment periods followed by no visibility afterwards (2013 comments weren't posted for three years!) exposes the lack of true transparency during this entire process.</p> <p>The responder to my comments about lack of transparency replied, "For information pertaining to how comments have been considered and responded to, please refer to Master Response 42."</p> <p>Master Response 42 does not address my concerns.</p> <p>For example, Master Response 42 points to the ridiculous "In-Delta" meetings as part of the outreach program. Everyone that attended the days in Brentwood, nearest to Discovery Bay, were appalled at the choice of the small, quiet Brentwood Library. We always hold our DB Town Hall Meetings in the DB Elementary Gym and the audience is typically around 500 attendees. The attendees who did stand in line spoke to young DWR representatives who could listen, but did not</p> | <p>This comment summarizes the commenter's desire for additional time to review the Final EIR/EIS and displeasure with the previous responses to comments.</p> <p>The response to previous comments remains correct and includes the information available. The public comment process was conducted as required by CEQA and NEPA.</p> <p>Please refer to Master Responses 40 and 41 in Volume 2, Final EIR/EIS, for information related to outreach, transparency of the planning process and stakeholder engagement. For information pertaining to how comments have been considered and addressed, please refer to Master Response 42 in Volume 2, Final EIR/EIS. The standard process for publishing comments submitted on CEQA and NEPA documents is to include them with the responses to comments in the Final EIR/EIS. Posting comments online is not a requirement of or a standard policy for CEQA or NEPA processes.</p> <p>This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----------|-----|-----|---|---|
| | | | <p>understand the issues. They had us all write our names before commenting yet Master Response 42 says it was difficult in small groups to know who to respond to. No notes were taken by those representatives nor was it videotaped (except by KSL TV and a newspaper reporter, both of which they attempted to block from any taping). Comments that were posted afterwards did not reflect what we said and were lacking key input. Those meetings were viewed as a farce.</p> <p>Comments made in person at BDCP meetings in Sacramento also were not incorporated or adequately responded to. What we were told at those meetings was also inaccurate (such as that DWR would specifically monitor Discovery Bay's unique waterways). Response 42 claims comment letters were posted to the website. The 2013 comments were not posted to the website. There was an outpouring of complaints about that failure. The first time I've seen comments posted or responded to were December 22, 2016.</p> <p>I still contend that the process used to develop the Final EIR/EIS was flawed and lacked transparency. And nothing in the rebuttal is convincing.</p> | |
| McCleery | Jan | 91. | <p>Comment 9: Delta Flows</p> <p>In 2016, I raised the issue that the Delta Plan, and hence the BDCP was supposed to, according to the Legislature's 2009 Delta Reform Act, start with the Delta Flow needs. The response was, basically, that the SWRCB 2010 Delta Flow report was ignored because it didn't give enough water to the exporters. That in a nutshell is the problem. As we know the exporters have been given water rights to ("excess" water for more water than is actually excess. So the starting point in this entire exercise is flawed.</p> <p>A newer report has been released by the Bay Institute/SWRCB which still contends that the current amount removed from the Delta is more than the Delta can sustain.</p> <p>In Comment 2670-9, I stated "The state needs to start asking questions about how many crops we can support, and on what land, and stop the "paper water" overcommitment of resources. It is the expansion of farming beyond the available water resources that has brought California to this brink of disaster. The state needs to identify the water requirements, as the Legislature dictated in 2009, before moving ahead."</p> <p>The answer shows the fundamental flaw in the BDCP plans. Answer: "State</p> | <p>This comment expresses the commenter's concerns that there would be changes in delta flows and water use.</p> <p>All of the alternatives evaluated in the Final EIR/EIS would only divert water under existing water rights. The proposed project does not seek any new water rights nor reduction in total water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation. It is understood that water rights issued to DWR and Reclamation are not fully available in many years to deliver total contract amounts to SWP and CVP water users due to available water supplies and demands of senior water rights holders and regulatory requirements. The State Water Resources Control Board is responsible for issuing the water rights and confirming that the use of the water rights are consistent with water rights law and the California Constitution.</p> <p>This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----------|-----|-----|---|---|
| | | | <p>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." There is an unstated and incorrect objective hidden in this response. The legislature has said "excess" water from the Delta should be put to "beneficial use." The plan, throughout it in every policy and consideration is to extract "as much water as possible" from the Delta to send outside of the Delta for "beneficial use" and is the "only" beneficial use.</p> <p>The plan fails to acknowledge that Delta farms are "beneficial use," that boating and recreation are "beneficial use," that clean water behind our homes in Discovery Bay for swimming and enjoyment is "beneficial use," that the flowing water in the amount needed to guide fish to the ocean is "beneficial use," and the amount of fresh water flowing out through the San Francisco Bay to keep it healthy is "beneficial use." There is lip service to these uses, but the failure to prioritize keeping salt water out of Delta farms, to keep boating and recreation available to communities requiring on it for their economy, and underlying the failure to start with acknowledgement of the Delta Flow requirements is a critical failure of this plan.</p> <p>It is particularly egregious when Central Valley farmers so blatantly expand almond orchards on both sides of I-5 during the drought and their almond profits increase year after year during the drought. It is egregious when the Response 24 to Delta as a Place refers to the need to address ground water overdrafting in the Central Valley but doesn't address the conversion of line crops to water-thirsty almond orchards that cannot be fallowed during the drought. Almond orchards whose roots reach down into the water table and drain nearby community's drinking water. The situation in the Central Valley needs to be addressed and managed. The process is seriously flawed. The DWR can claim it isn't their responsibility to monitor proper use of the beneficial water, but it isn't their right to remove water from the original users and cause them damage in order to give water to Central Valley almond growers.</p> | |
| McCleery | Jan | 92. | <p>Comment 10: Failure to Properly Consider Actual Alternatives</p> <p>Besides the lack of proper analysis of the Eastern Alignment relative to uses of the Delta as a Place, a valid range of alternatives was not considered. Every "alternative" that is analyzed completely in the plan (that passed the initial screening steps) except No Alternative and Alternative 9 has two common elements: (1) Removing water from the Sacramento River near Hood and (2) Transporting it to the Clifton Court Forebay for pumping to the Central Valley Corporate Agribusinesses and L.A. That makes them not true alternatives; rather they are slight</p> | <p>This comment explains the commenter's desire for the project to consider additional alternatives.</p> <p>As stated in response to comment 2760-6 on the Recirculated Draft EIR/EIS in Volume 2, Final EIR/EIS, 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. The specific proposals that</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>variations on the same theme.</p> <p>There is another alternative Rep. Garamendi offered which he called a "Portfolio." It included one smaller pipeline and other water-producing or water-saving measures. Master Response 24 claims the objective in this project was only to improve the current operations of the current system. I would argue that narrow view ignores a wider range of better alternatives.</p> <p>Note: Even with Rep. Garamendi's alternative, the smaller pipeline would be objectionable if it caused anywhere near the disruption to boating and recreation and waterways that the current Alternative 4A causes.</p> <p>Reducing reliance on the Delta is part of the Delta Plan requirements, so it would be appropriate for the plan to include reduction of pumping from the Delta combined with other choices such as restoring the Tulare Lake Basin, Desalination, etc. or Rep. Garamendi's "Portfolio."</p> <p>The screening of a desalination option by Antioch was rejected due to cost. Since that time, the above-ground canal plan was replaced with a much more costly tunnels plan. Also the reference for desalination dated back to 2007 and another 2010. Since that time significant improvements have been made at Livermore Labs regarding desalination technology, reducing costs.</p> <p>The fact that this entire EIR only focuses on one basic alternative with minor variations disqualifies it and means it has failed to truly consider alternatives.</p> <p>On the other hand, some alternatives that are in the plan should never be alternatives at all and need to be removed from any future consideration.</p> <p>Alternative 9 would wall-off Middle River and make it the water contractor's own private pipeline through the South Delta. This would block ALL boats from Discovery Bay and the rest of the Delta south of the railroad tracks from going East to Mildred Island, Bullfrog, Lost Isle, or Tiki Lagoon).</p> <p>Even worse, today if the Orwood RR Bridge isn't operable or needs maintenance, the railroad operates the alternate RR Bridge on Middle River, 24x7, year-round. But with these dams, boats too tall to fit under the railroad trestle would be blocked from getting to the alternate bridge; hence would be blocked from going to/from Discovery Bay to the rest of the Delta. That is scary, atrocious, and</p> | <p>were considered but ultimately rejected are discussed in Appendix 3A of the DEIR/EIS, Identification of Water Conveyance Alternatives, Conservation Measure 1. Appendix 3A thoroughly explains why various proposals were not analyzed in the EIR/EIS.</p> <p>This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|----------|-----|-----|--|---|
| | | | <p>according to the “Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899,” illegal. Although it is not the current preferred alternative in the EIR, it is still atrocious that this idea of walling of Middle River keeps coming up in various State plans and projects.</p> <p>We have proven in the past that “Operable Barriers” are extremely dangerous for boaters. See the RBOC’s letter to the USBR on the Two-Gates Fish Protection Plan, plus my comments and many other comments.</p> <p>These are equivalent to dams, for boaters. Such plans as Alternative 9 are illegal and should be removed from the EIR.</p> | |
| McCleery | Jan | 93. | <p>Comment 11: Water Quality for the South Delta and Discovery Bay waterways</p> <p>A expert on water issues testified to the SWRCB that the EIR fails to identify or analyze the potential for the [Delta Tunnels] project to create or to exacerbate impacts to human health and the environment from blue-green algae (cyanobacteria) and their toxins within Discovery Bay.</p> <p>In November at the SWRCB Hearings regarding of the DWR Permit Request, the testimony of Thomas K. Burke included many concerns about the salinity of water in the Discovery Bay waterways.</p> <p>First, I want to point out that at a BDCP Meeting held in Sacramento where I was present to offer my comments to the BDCP Board, Dr. Jerry Meral, then director of the board, promised the Discovery Bay citizens that there would be specific monitoring added to the Discovery Bay waterways and analysis concerning our bays. At that meeting he asked to have a meeting with the STCDA attorney where he again reiterated he would analyze and protect the Discovery Bay waterways.</p> <p>But at the SWRCB hearing, I heard that the compliance station used to analyze salinity effects on Discovery Bay was D-1641 and that, due to its location, compliance there in modeling does not mean that our area would have reasonable salinity controls. Worse, I heard that the DSM2 models are used to feed the CALSIM II models. Yet the DSM2 model was set up to run for a water period ending in 1991.</p> <p>The state didn’t exceed the recommended (by the environmental scientists when the pumps were installed) maximum limit of 5.0 MAF until the late ‘90s. So any models that stop prior to the late ‘90s are lacking important information.</p> <p><i>Figure 8. Five-Year Water Export Averages.</i></p> | <p>This comment summarizes information which was presented at SWRCB hearings regarding salinity in the Delta. The commenter expresses concern for the salinity levels in Discovery Bay.</p> <p>See Section 4, State Water Board Change Petition Process, Developments after Publication of the Proposed Final Environmental Impact Report, for discussion on State Water Recourses Control Board hearing materials.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----------|-----|-----|--|---|
| | | | <p>Expert analysis has determined that the amount of salinity in the Discovery Bay waterways is very likely to exceed acceptable limits.</p> <p>Furthermore, when I testified before the SWRCB Hearings in November regarding the culture of Discovery Bay, the DWR lawyer who cross-examined me asked me if it would be so bad if Discovery Bay were salt water. He said something to the extent of, "Lots of people buy homes on the ocean, which is salt water." A DWR lawyer who cross examined the STCDA expert witnesses also asked him if he was an expert in agriculture and if so, what percent salt in the water negatively affects agriculture.</p> <p>That's pretty clear evidence that the DWR does not plan to uphold its promise to keep Discovery Bay's waterways clean and fresh, to ensure the community's culture as a freshwater community and way of life are preserved.</p> | |
| McCleery | Jan | 94. | <p>Comment 12: Failing to Meet the Delta Plan Requirements regarding the "Delta as a Place"</p> <p>This has been referred to above, but the response to many of my comments regarding the effect of this project on Discovery Bay, how blocking and ruining our waterways nearby will affect our life here in Discovery Bay, was "See Master Response 24 about the Delta as a Place." That response claims the BDCP has mitigated our "Delta as a Place" complaints by adding recreation improvements and expansion at Brannon Island State Part. Although that provides more recreation in the Delta in general, it doesn't help mitigate Discovery Bay's "Delta as a Place" issues or economy.</p> <p>The Master Response 24 also claims that it isn't the DWR's responsibility to protect these areas and that the Delta is an evolving place: "Protecting the Delta as an evolving place means accepting that change will not stop, but that the fundamental characteristics and values that contribute to the Delta's special qualities and that distinguishes it from other places can be preserved and enhanced while accommodating these changes (Delta Vision Blue Ribbon Task Force 2008). It does not mean that the Delta should be a fortress, a preserve, or a museum. (Delta Plan, Ch. 5 at p. 167.)"</p> <p>Master Response 24 says the Delta is an "evolving place". That is true but it doesn't mean the State can come in and destroy existing communities. The MR 24 says the EIR includes mitigation. No, the mitigation is invalid. Putting a construction project in the middle of recreational areas and digging up waterways is different from accepting evolving change. The DWR has not taken consideration of</p> | <p>This comment expresses the commenter's concern that the project will affect way of life in the Delta.</p> <p>This comment was previously responded to in response to comments on the Recirculated Draft EIR/EIS. Master Response 24, Volume 2, Final EIR/EIS, provides the commenter information regarding Delta as a Place. Impacts for each resource area are discussed under their respective sections. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----------|-----|-----|--|---|
| | | | <p>the community's need nor tried to minimize their affect.</p> <p>The California WaterFix project violates water code § 85045.</p> | |
| McCleery | Jan | 95. | <p>Comment 13: Inverse Condemnation of the Delta and Discovery Bay</p> <p>The public expects state agencies to take into consideration significant negative impacts on large communities. The failure to include the impacts to Discovery Bay in this EIR and the failure to recognize DB's reliance on boating and recreation on its economy and culture is criminal.</p> <p>One is left to believe that the DWR has decided that, with global warming, salt water is bound to intrude during the next hundred years, and instead of trying to protect Delta communities, the State will abandon them.</p> <p>This belief, that the DWR is condemning Discovery Bay, is reinforced by the response to my 2013 comment 1970-2 where the DWR said: "While the environmental commitments would reduce impacts on water-based recreation (water-skiing, wakeboarding, tubing) in these areas by creating alternative recreation opportunities for those eliminated during construction, these impacts would be long-term and therefore considered significant and unavoidable."</p> <p>If I read it right, that says that the commitment in the EIR to restore our waterways to their prior state refer only to environmental needs and not recreation or esthetics. That says that for our primary water ski/wakeboarding sloughs, Twin Slough and the West side of Mildred Island, which will be decimated by eleven years of barges, docks, etc., there will be no attempt to return them into nice waterski/wakeboard sloughs. Mildred Island may never be a usable anchorage. Thus the impact to recreation for the South Delta is long term.</p> <p>I feel abandoned by the state.</p> <p>For years, starting when our kids were 5 and 7, our family would drive from Sunnyvale to the Delta nearly every Friday night during the summer. We'd launch our ski boat at Russo's Marina on Bethel Island and head off somewhere, find a quiet spot to anchor, put up the canvas and roll out the sleeping bags, and tie up for the night. We'd spend Saturday and Sunday on the waterways, teaching the kids to ski or pulling them behind on the "enterprise" (blow-up) or just jumping of the back swimming. Or we'd find a small beach for the kids to make mud pies and have fun. We'd barbecue at night with the sun setting behind us. The Delta has amazing sunsets. The people writing these plans should really come spend time on the Delta.</p> | <p>This comment is regarding the commenter's opinion that the project will cause permanent impacts to recreation in the area.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure AES-1d, Restore Barge Unloading Facility Sites Once Decommissioned, will minimize the impact on visual quality and character at barge facility sites after construction.</p> <p>This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----------|-----|-----|---|---|
| | | | <p>We spend endless weekends at Mildred Island, anchored out at night and skiing the sloughs just west of Mildred Island. We fell in love with the Delta, so moved to Discovery Bay when we retired.</p> <p>We had worked in Silicon Valley for over 30 years, saving money so we could have a nice retirement. Some people have a second home in the mountains or in Palm Springs. Our big boat is in the dock behind our house and is our "second home." Our kids and grandkids spend summer weekends with us, going waterskiing from our house or taking the boats to Mildred Island for a nice weekend. This is our life, this is what we love This plan is threatening to destroy our waterways, take away recreation from our nearby sloughs, ruin our anchorage, and change our way of life. We will not be able to take the money out of our waterfront retirement home and live anywhere else that is as wonderful as life on the Delta. The human factor is being neglected in this plan.</p> <p>Abandoning our area of origin protections is an inverse condemnation of Delta and of Discovery Bay.</p> <p>It breaks my heart that you are destroying our community for not only my husband and I, but for our children and grandchildren.</p> | |
| | | 96. | <p>Comment 14: The Delta should be named a National Recreation Area</p> <p>I read that some areas of the Delta are proposed to be Heritage Sites. More importantly, the Delta should be named a National Recreation Area. It is similar to Lake Powell, another NRA, with a thousand mile of waterways. Boating needs to be preserved here because that is the only way to truly explore the Delta. Adding trails and bicycle lanes is nice, but misses the mark in understanding best way, and in most places the only way the public can enjoy this national resource: by boat. The state should add houseboat and other rentals to Brannan State Park and encourage tourism to this wonderful resource.</p> | This section does not raise any new issues that weren't addressed in the Final EIR/S. No issues regarding the adequacy of the environmental impact analysis in the EIR/EIS is raised. |
| McCleery | Jan | 97. | <p>CONCLUSION: The EIR is incomplete because it did not adequately consider an Eastern alternative that would avoid destroying recreational waterways in order to minimize the impact of the project and preserve boating and recreation and the economies that depend on it. A route that would not go through the heart of the Delta but would instead protect and preserve it.</p> | This comment is a summary of the commenter's opinions on the project. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| McCleery | Jan | 98. | <p>Comments about the EIR for the record from Gay Wold, attached. They are related to Chapter 15 - Recreation and also the Construction plans regarding waterways around Discovery Bay.</p> | This comment is about recreation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| McCleery | Jan | 99. | <p>I would like to request an extension to the 30-day comment period on</p> | This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. |

| | | | | |
|----------|---------|------|---|---|
| | | | <p>the Final BDCP California WaterFix EIR/EIS.</p> <p>The 30-day period is insufficient because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The clock started during the holidays, so is shortened because of people being busy with family and friends 2. The communication about the final EIR/EIS and comment period requirements has been poor. For example, I just today tracked down this email address (and that was from a lawyer who asked another lawyer who had called the DWR offices directly and got the address). Normal humans need better notification and a webpage to get the review information from. I have not yet been able to find a webpage with the end date, this address, and snail mail address and I think I've done extensive clicking around. 3. It took the DWR three years to post our 2013 comments and responses; over one year for the 2015 comments. First, it wasn't clear our 2013 and 2015 comment responses were included when the original Final EIR/EIS announcement was sent out. That our comments were responded to was only recently pointed out to me by someone who's full-time hobby is following the California WaterFix activities, The format everything is posted on is not the easiest to find people's comments and review responses. People are just now becoming aware of their existence and need time to review. They need more time to review responses to their comments. 4. I think the right process in 2013 would have been to re-circulate the Draft EIR/EIS after it received a failing grade from US EPA. Under the law I believe you are required to fix the problems and recirculate a draft EIR for further public comment when that happens. So this 30 day comment period seems like a substitute for that required re-circulation which should have been a long time ago and allowed for a much longer comment period. Because of this we should have at least 90 days and you should hold a public hearing now. 5. The new, Final EIR/EIS is huge, has many changes (such as the significant change in financing allocation), and will definitely take more than 30 days (now only ten left since I just now am tracking down the information) to review. More reason for more time and a public hearing. | <p>This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| McCleery | Michael | 100. | Please see attached Work Document: | <p>This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| Mccoy | Dane | 101. | Please extend the time to respond to the final water fix EIR. | <p>This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period.</p> |

| | | | | |
|-----------|-------|------|--|---|
| | | | <p>The Draft EIR/S was not recirculated after it received a failing grade from USEPA. The law clearly states it is a requirement to fix the problems and recirculate a draft EIR for further public comment when that happens.</p> <p>Instead they are using this final 30 day comment period in place of that required recirculation. It should have been recirculated shortly after the draft EIR/S received a failing grade which should have allowed for a much longer comment period. Because of this there should be no less than 90 days from December 31, 2016 for the people of the State of California respond and hold a public hearing now.</p> | <p>This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| McDonough | Larry | 102. | <p>Please don't build the tunnels. It's a waste of money and not needed!</p> | <p>This comment is about purpose and need. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| McDowell | John | 103. | <p>Please extend the comment period for 90 days or more.</p> | <p>This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| McNear | John | 104. | <p>I thought that I had sent you the following comment some time ago. I searched through the comments below without finding it, so here it is again (approximately).</p> <p>Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta Water First, let me tell you where I am coming from; I was born in 1929 and spent the first 20 years of my life at McNear's Beach, at the east edge of Marin County. I shoot at a duck club in the Suisun Marsh, near Suisun City. The salinity there is about 1000 parts per million. (I can give you more detail, if you want.)</p> <p>In the 1930's and early 1940's, seaweed formed on the rocks at McNear's Beach in the late summer and would disappear the following spring. The disappearance stopped when Shasta Dam was built. The shrimp, which were caught by China Camp, next door, also disappeared then.</p> <p>I had a great uncle who lived in Rio Vista. From him and other news I was told that water flowing past there was fresh with the outgoing tide and salty with the incoming tide-even for sometime after Shasta Dam's construction.</p> <p>You asked me for my comment about the proposed twin tunnels under the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta. I responded that I thought</p> | <p>This comment is about water quality. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----------|----------------|------|--|--|
| | | | they were fine if only the intakes were were moved from near Courtland to near Rio Vista, and only operated on the outgoing tide. This would stop the confusion of the fish, thinking that the ocean was at Clifton Court Forebay. | |
| Medina | Alexandra Baca | 105. | <p>The Delta is part of the town of Discovery Bay. We live, eat and play on the Delta. It is part of our economy. We are a boating community and without boats, Discovery Bay's economy will fall apart. We need the recreation on the water to survive and thrive. Taking away one of the most popular sloughs on the delta would be detrimental to our waterways.</p> <p>It would put Bullfrog out of business along with make it a lot harder to get to places like Mildred and up around to Stockton. Without that waterway being open and available for skiers, wake boarders, etc. along with those who just pass through, would be detrimental to us. It would also have a negative impact on places in Stockton because we would not be able to go that way if you cut our sloughs off.</p> <p>Please hear the public outcry and stop taking our water and stop the plans to shut down twin sloughs.</p> | This comment is on recreation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Medina | Bobby | 106. | <p>have been a long time resident of Discovery Bay, and for all the years I have been here, the water ways, sports and life of the CA Deltas is a HUGE part of our lives.</p> <p>The water is the main reason why we have chosen to live here. Every summer, people from all over the state and country come here to play in our beautiful waterways. Why would the state EVER want to take that away from us.</p> <p>Imagine if the place where YOU as a family or individual goes, or lives was to be changed for the worse based on something that the STATE wants to do to benefit an agenda that isn't part of a reason why you live or visit there.</p> <p>Please, reconsider the barge, the tunnel and all the disruption of our waterways.</p> <p>there are so many other places along the delta that this can be done, and NOT effect the community,.</p> | This comment is about recreation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Melendez | George | 107. | <p>I am writing as a concerned citizen from Discovery Bay. I understand that the state is planning to install a pipe from Mildred Island through twin sloughs. I believe this work will have a detrimental impact on the neighborhoods around the Delta, e.g., Discovery Bay community.</p> <p>I live in Discovery Bay and my access of Delta will be restricted due to the planning of the work by the state. We moved to Discovery Bay to enjoy the large waterways of the Delta.</p> | This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation and alternatives selection. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |

| | | | | |
|--------|-------|------|---|---|
| | | | I ask the state to review for alternate plans so the communities in the Delta can continue to enjoy the recreational freedom we come to enjoy on the delta. | |
| Mendes | Karen | 108. | <p>I am writing to express my concern about the tunnels that will completely destroy Discovery Bay.</p> <p>My husband, son and I recently moved to Discovery Bay. We purchased a home on deep water because of our love for boating and water recreation. We are avid wakeboarders, we love to swim from our dock and we even built a waterslide on our boat dock for our 12 year old son. We also enjoy fishing. All of this is a huge part of our life and it is the reason that we sold a couple of properties to be able to purchase a single home here.</p> <p>Finding out about the states plans to destroy our way of life terrifies me. A huge part of our towns' economy comes from the marina, the yacht harbor, and boat and marine based businesses. If these tunnels are built, our water will become polluted, salty and stagnant. We will be unable to even swim in our back yard. How would you tell your son that he can't swim in his own backyard because the water is polluted? Property values would plummet. We would not even be able to sell our home – which would basically bankrupt my family and every other hard working family in this area. Property taxes collected would also plummet as a result and eventually Discovery Bay, as we know and love it, would cease to exist.</p> <p>I find this very appalling, considering that there are laws out there that protect our water and the state thinks that they don't need to adhere to them. This construction project and tunnels operation violates California Water Code section 85045. The projects in the Delta are supposed to achieve their objectives in "a manner that protects and enhances the unique cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of the Delta as an evolving place." It is crystal clear that the Tunnels violate the law.</p> <p>Please stop the tunnels.</p> | This comment is about recreation, water quality, socioeconomic impacts, Water Code Section 85045. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Moore | Vonis | 109. | <p>The majority of Californians oppose the Twin tunnels project as demonstrated repeatedly over time when similar Delta water transport systems have been proposed. (as in Peripheral Canal). In fact, the peripheral canal was previously voted down on a statewide ballot initiative. The rationale has not changed with the revised Twin tunnels project. This project has not been put before the voters and you are trying to sneak this project through, and ram this project through, against the will of the people.</p> <p>This project moves water from Northern California farm areas to the</p> | This comment is about agriculture, water quality, and aesthetics .This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |

| | | | | |
|--------|---------|------|--|--|
| | | | <p>Central Valley and Southern California areas. Many of these Central and Southern California farms are in arid climates, too dry to support vegetation without our water. Yet these large corporate farmers have recklessly expanded their desert farms with complete disregard for the environment, expecting to steal water from more environmentally responsible Delta farmers and the people of Northern California. This project jeopardizes the environment, local farms, the quality of water in Northern California, the wildlife and the natural beauty of the Delta. The politicians who support this project have a conflict of interest and blatant disregard for the environment and the will of the people.</p> | |
| Morgan | Captain | 110. | <p>This is Captain Morgan with Captain Morgans Delta Adventures.</p> <p>I own and operate a Charter Boat Cruise business out of Discovery Bay, CA and have done so since 2012. I object to anything that inhibits my ability to navigate Twin Sloughs, also known as Victoria Slough and Woodward Slough.</p> <p>The slough's mentioned above are on the main cruising route for many of our Delta Cruises that allow thousands of guests each year to experience and learn about the California Delta. One example is our "Wilderness ECO-Lunch Cruise"(click on link below for cruise details) that is a 2-hour narrated cruise that departs from Discovery Bay. The ECO-cruise heads east down Twin Sloughs, North past Ski Beach and the Fairy crossing, then West down Railroad Slough, South at the Orwood Railroad Bridge and back to Discovery Bay.</p> <p>This Delta "loop" is a 2-hour loop from Discovery Bay and allow guests to see and hear many interesting things along the cruise without having to cruise out on the Delta for an hour, and right back to Discovery Bay on the same route they had just cruised.</p> <p>If the Twin Tunnel Project does move forward, it MUST consider and accommodate the interests of Discovery Bay residents/boats, local businesses, and visitors to the area. Anything that shuts down or in any way makes any slough, river, or other waterway un-passable is TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE!!!</p> <p>Wilderness Lunch & Eco-Cruise</p> | <p>This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| Morgan | Hilary | 111. | <p>I am a concord resident and have been going to the delta to wakeboard twin sloughs for a decade! By taking away twin sloughs you will destroy the economy of discovery bay because no one will want to buy houses or take their boats to the delta. Twins sloughs in the delta is one of a kind. I am deeply saddened by the proposition to alter a place so dear to my heart.</p> <p>I object to any altering of twin sloughs.</p> | <p>This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----------|------------------|------|--|---|
| | | | Please consider the implication of these plans and the community you will effect. | |
| Morris | Lance | 112. | Please save twins sloughs as a recreational ski area. It is vital to all the homes in discovery Bay ,Byron, Brentwood and Antioch. And not to mention all the out-of-towners that launch their boats at Orwood marina and discovery Bay Marina. It is a ma... | This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Nadelman | David and Laurie | 113. | <p>I am a concerned property owner in the town of Discovery Bay California.</p> <p>I have been boating in the Delta/Discovery Bay for over 35 years and 4 years ago bought a home on the water that my husband and I are planning on retiring in.</p> <p>We have been bringing our children, family and friends boating and our plan is to one day have our grandchildren come and enjoy the life we have.</p> <p>It is very disappointing to keep having to fight to keep our beautiful community just that a beautiful fun place to be.</p> <p>The Tunnel would be disasterous by making our tunnels salty and stagnant and will ruin our boating.</p> <p>It will affect everyone's lifestyle in Discovery Bay and the economy.</p> <p>A significant portion of our town's economy comes from boat/marine based businesses including the marina, shops and restaurants.</p> <p>Our waterfront homes will lose property values because of salty, polluted water in our bays and Willow Lake, more blue-green algae, or nearby water ways destroyed by the construction project, and our our home values will drop. Which means a drop in property taxes.</p> <p>The Tunnels project violates the Delta Reform Act and the Delta Plan, because projects in the Delta are supposed to achieve their objectives in "a manner that protects and enhances the unique cultural, recreational, natural resource and agricultural values of the Delta as an evolving place". California Water Code 85045.</p> <p>So it is very clear cut: The Tunnels violate the law because they do not comply with Water Code Section 85045.</p> | This comment is about recreation, water quality, socioeconomic impacts, and the Delta Reform Act. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Nielsen | Kevin | 114. | I am requesting you , please look at other alternatives to your tunnels. Your plan as you have it now, will decimate our close nit town and | [Comment received after the end of 30-day NEPA review period on January 30, 2017] This comment is about alternatives selection. This |

| | | | | |
|---------|-------|------|---|---|
| | | | <p>boating community.</p> <p>I have worked very hard to have a house out here ,where I can watch my kids grow up and enjoy the water ways of discovery Bay.</p> <p>Why, in your plans do you not even mention the effect it will have on our community of Discovery Bay.</p> <p>Please please please look other alternatives for your project.</p> | <p>comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| Noblitt | Julie | 115. | <p>I am writing as a homeowner and avid user of the Delta Waterways for recreation. I am urging you to consider alternate Delta waterway plans as outlined below. The current plans will be detrimental to the economy and community of Discovery Bay. The economy of Discovery Bay will be greatly impacted by these plans as boating recreation is the staple of our community. There are over 2,300 waterfront homes that each have boat slips. The recreational boaters need continuous sloughs where they can go up to 30 mph without barges forcing them to slow to 5 mph to maneuver around. I object!!</p> <p>It makes since to use the Eastern Alignment Alternative. This would be best for boaters, fish, waterfowl, and the Delta. This route does not affect any towns or communities. There is nothing in the EIR "Alternatives Considered" documentation that considers the impact on the people who are ultimately involved. AT A MINIMUM consider moving the barge locations around the corner on each island. This will Saving help save our wildlife and our community economically.</p> | <p>This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation and alternatives selection. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| Orgain | Steve | 116. | <p>I am a resident of Discovery Bay. I am vehemently opposed to the delta tunnel project.</p> <p>I have been coming to the delta for over forty years, mainly to water ski, but also to fish, and enjoy the many restaurants and communities on the water throughout the delta. When the community of Discovery was developed, I was determined to one day own a home on deep water, where right in my back yard, I could have my boat and access to the many FRESH waterways to do what I love. That dream came true five years ago, when I bought my home on Salmon Court in Discovery Bay. Homes on deep water are more expensive, but to me, well worth it. I plan to retire here in the next few years and spend many hours boating on the delta.</p> <p>It is clear, that diverting the fresh water that feeds the delta will have a devastating impact on Discovery Bay and the surrounding communities. Not only the undoubted influx of salt water to our fresh water, but disturbing effect of the construction project to the environment.</p> | <p>This comment is about recreation, water quality (salinity), agriculture, and water code 85045. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |

| | | | | |
|---------|----------|------|--|---|
| | | | <p>The economy in the delta communities will be adversely affected as well. Yacht harbors, restaurants, boat, and boat accessory businesses, waterfront restaurants, produce stands, and more will be negatively affected.</p> <p>I am also a Golf member at the Discovery Bay country club. The beautiful fairways and land scape rely on the fresh water from the delta. Salt infused water would have devastating effect on the golf course as well.</p> <p>Our neighboring community of Brentwood, is loaded with farms that produce delicious corn, Cherries, tomatoes, and more. These farms are irrigated with the FRESH water of the delta. Without a doubt, the result of diverting fresh water, and adding salinity will be devastating to our local farming community.</p> <p>I know that the Huge consortium of Almond growers in the central valley who want the delta water, could care less about our community, or the devastating effects that WILL result from the tunnel project. The state water code 85045 , if upheld, should protect the unique delta community and Discovery Bay from the effects of the tunnel project. I hope this law is upheld.</p> <p>I would appreciate a response to my opposition, and grave concerns.</p> | |
| Orgain | Steve | 117. | <p>Re: Delta Tunnel review.</p> <p>The 30 day comment period for the latest delta tunnel project is not nearly enough time.</p> <p>With our northern California reservoirs reaching capacity, I would think the proposed recipients of the northern California, and delta water would be figuring out adequate water storage.</p> <p>To date, no adequate alternatives, or storage elements have been addressed.</p> <p>The 30 day comment period need to be extended to at least 90 days, so that all that are affected by this project have time to respond.</p> | This comment is about alternatives selection. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Padilla | Jennifer | 118. | <p>I am in complete disbelief of your plan to build docks in our heavily used sloughs. We are residents of Discovery Bay, where we pay a ton of taxes and other "extra fees" to live in this water community. We have a boat and dock at our home. We use these water ways all year in our boat. Blocking them and/or turning them into 5 mph zones is absolutely ridiculous! You can certainly find another spot to build your docks and put your barges. There is a whole economy that is</p> | This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |

| | | | | |
|----------|----------------|------|---|--|
| | | | dependent on the boating community, gas stations, docks, restaurants, etc. | |
| Parker | Neal and Diane | 119. | We have been boating in the Delta for nearly thirty years. We have watched some of our favorite places and anchorages close. Egeria densa and water hyacinth have taken a serious toll. Mildred Island is one of the only places where a large group of boats can anchor and people swim and cool off in the delta heat. Closing mildred will be a death blow to recreational boating in the delta. It will have a severe economic impact on the whole area. We might have to get out of boating years earlier than we planned. Please reconsider this horrible plan. | [Comment received after the end of 30-day NEPA review period on January 30, 2017] This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Phillips | Don | 120. | Please extend the twin tunnel review period at least 90 days. Thank you. | This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Philpott | Erika | 121. | I have lived in Discovery Bay for the majority of my life and have used the Twin Sloughs almost every weekend and every summer that I've lived there. The changes that you are planning to make to the sloughs will drastically impact the residences abilities to use the delta to its full convenience. There are very few spots close to Discovery Bay in which you can jump on a wakeboard and get a decent ride. There are other sloughs in which you can go to however, it is quite a drive and the water is usually not as nice. Furthermore, the changes that you will be making to the sloughs cuts Discovery Bay residence off from ski beach, a local watering hole, as well as access to other branches of the delta. Not only will it impact the places in which we can participate in water sports but it will pack it nearly impossible to enjoy the water ways during the summer once construction begins. Please leave the sloughs the way they are! There is no reason to make the changes in which you are planning to make. | This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Price | Martin | 122. | Please extend the comment period on this issue to (90) ninety days. | This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Puckett | AJ | 123. | As a beloved Delta boater I spent all of my childhood out on the delta. It is truly a unique place where people can go out and enjoy some night weather and spend time on the water. This project you have looming in your eyes would be a terrible idea and RUIN!!! the essence and beloved childhood memories I created and in forthcoming years children could make. Please consider this and for the families that love it out there! Thank you for your time!! | This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Puckett | Jake | 124. | Below is a link that I just got finished reading; https://nodeltagates.com/2017/01/24/do-you-skiwakeboard-the-twin- | This comment is about socioeconomic impacts, and terrestrial and aquatic resources. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously |

| | | | | |
|---------|------|------|--|---|
| | | | <p><u>sloughs/</u></p> <p>The article highlights plans revolving around building a tunnel and ferry bridge through a very high trafficked recreation area of the CA Delta. As a recreational boater out of Discovery Bay, I would like to bring further attention to the impact of this plan outside of just recreational boating. Think of the impact on the surrounding community, businesses, and wildlife that this would impact. Because this could change the overall flow of traffic, a decision of this magnitude should not be made without involving local business owners such as; Union Point Bar, Discovery Bay Yacht Club and Marina, Orwood Resort and Marina, NorCal Mastercraft and Pro Shop, and Golden Gate Ski Club. Furthermore the environmental impact of wildlife in the area would be effected as well. This is an area that fish and native birds inhabit, and a tunnel and barge will not only effect spawning grounds, but nesting areas for birds as well.</p> <p>All of these issues can be avoided with some further research and planning on an alternative location. Please understand that the potential impact of these plans could close the doors of businesses, deter local boaters, uproot nesting and spawning wildlife, and crumble a local economy.</p> <p>Please take the time to read and further investigate this decision.</p> | addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Puckett | Jake | 125. | <p>Below is a link that I just got finished reading;</p> <p>https://nodeltagates.com/2017/01/24/do-you-skiwakeboard-the-twin-sloughs/</p> <p>The article highlights plans revolving around building a tunnel and ferry bridge through a very high trafficked recreation area of the CA Delta. As a recreational boater out of Discovery Bay, I would like to bring further attention to the impact of this plan outside of just recreational boating. Think of the impact on the surrounding community, businesses, and wildlife that this would impact. Because this could change the overall flow of traffic, a decision of this magnitude should not be made without involving local business owners such as; Union Point Bar, Discovery Bay Yacht Club and Marina, Orwood Resort and Marina, NorCal Mastercraft and Pro Shop, and Golden Gate Ski Club. Furthermore the environmental impact of wildlife in the area would be effected as well. This is an area that fish and native birds inhabit, and a tunnel and barge will not only effect spawning grounds, but nesting areas for birds as well.</p> <p>All of these issues can be avoided with some further research and planning on an alternative location. Please understand that the</p> | This comment is about socioeconomic impacts, and terrestrial and aquatic resources. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |

| | | | | |
|--|----|------|--|--|
| | | | <p>potential impact of these plans could close the doors of businesses, deter local boaters, uproot nesting and spawning wildlife, and crumble a local economy.</p> <p>Please take the time to read and further investigate this decision.</p> | |
| Read | T. | 126. | <p>It's to bad that Jerry Brown has such a hard on the get these Tunnels done at the expense of the recreational boating and fishing not mention what it's going to do to the Property values of Discovery Bay and neighboring areas.</p> <p>This has been voted down before, why are we going through this once again. I think this goes back to when Jerry's Dad was in office,and voted down at that time..</p> <p>I've been boating on the Delta sense 1964 and have seen the Delta go down each year. This appears to be a water grab from Southern Ca.They must be padding out governors pockets real well.</p> <p>Let's think about the damage its going to do to the Ecco system of the Delta and so much of filling the swimming pools in LA..</p> <p>The Tunnels are like the Train to no were. When the Train was put up to the voters they/we were Lied to about the cost.</p> <p>Both of these project are so far over budget it's out of control. Why not put them both up to the voters again and see were they go. The Delta is my Home.</p> | <p>This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| Read | T. | 127. | <p>Why is it Jerry Brown is on this Mission to steal/grab what ever he wants when it comes to the California Delta.</p> <p>I as well as my whole family has been boating on the Delta sense 1964 and moved to Discovery Bay on 1989.</p> <p>By Cal-water allowing Jerry Brown to continue this water grab is destroying the Delta and the recreation that is offers thousand of Boater,fisherman,water skiers and wakeboard.</p> <p>The Tunnels he is shoving down your throats don't produce any more water they only steal what we have and ship it South to fill more swimming pools.</p> <p>Let's get a clue here. When is this going to STOP???????</p> | <p>[Comment received after the end of 30-day NEPA review period on January 30, 2017] This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |
| Rigid71hd@yahoo.com | | 128. | <p>Hello it is with great sadness and anxiety that I am emailing today . I 100 percent oppose the idea of closing or even altering the twin sloughs area coming from Discovery Bay . Please consider the economy of Discovery Bay and how unfair it is for the people that purchased</p> | <p>This comment is about socioeconomic impacts, terrestrial and aquatic resources, and alternatives selection. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--------|-------|------|---|--|
| | | | homes there with the intention of using the locals waterways for recreation. Please consider the impact to local resorts this poorly thought out plan will impact . Please do not use this area to attempt a solution for the states water issues . I know that everyone I have ever spoke about these issues with opposes all of this water diversion . The damage to the ecology and marine biology is going to be irreparable. Especially the impact the San Pablo bay will suffer from this poorly though out plan. Please at least use the eastern alignment option if you must move forward against the wishes of just about all Californians . Thank you | |
| Ryan | Keith | 129. | <p>Thanks in advance for reading my comments on the “water fix proposal” I have been living and playing in the Delta area for over 30 years and am very concerned about the devastation that will be caused by this insane idea called the water fix. Moving water from one area to another area and calling it a water fix is nothing more than fraud or a lie, take your pick. I have boated around 95% of all waterways in the Delta and know it better than most. I also know that the most active area east of Discovery Bay is known by locals as Twin slough (North Victoria Canal/Woodward canal) and is by far the most traveled area in the entire Delta. There is an island at the East end called “Ski Beach” and is one of the few sand beaches in the entire South Delta. On a busy weekend day there are no less than 100 boats that go to Ski Beach which makes it the most active recreational beach in the entire Delta. (see photo) Almost all of the boats come from either Discovery Bay or Orwood resort and travel down “Twin Soughs”. In addition this stretch of Delta is one of the most popular areas for water sports in the Delta, due to the straight water ways more dense population and proximity to south launching ramps.</p> <p>The water fix proposal would block most or all of this water way, and negatively impact thousands of boaters that travel to this area. In addition, the local business (Union Point restaurant, Bull Frog resort, Orewood resort, and others) would be servely impacted since they would be “cut off” from the primary water ways. Unlikely these business would be able to survive. This would also become a safety issue since emergency boats (Sheriff) would have to go alternative routes which could add 20 minutes to the route. (becomes a life or death issue)</p> <p>In summary I strongly oppose this plan and suggest alternative locations to the East or not at all. (maybe the funds would be better spent on reservoirs)</p> | This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation and alternatives selection. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Schalk | Chuck | 130. | I have been a CA resident for 40 years skiing/boating on the Delta. I have a house in Discovery bay to better access the waterways for weekday, afternoon outings ect. I am part of a big family (20 of us and we all use the delta for family fun). | This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |

| | | | | |
|---------|---------|------|---|---|
| | | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do not take away the family aspect of boating by closing waterways. 2. You will decrease home values around the water. 3. Small business's on the water and abroad will suffer 4. California is known for the Delta and water activity 5. Closing waterways, placing barges and dock will be DANGEROUS and likely increase accidents and possible deaths. <p>Leave the waterways alone, as they are here for public enjoyment and family/sporting fun.</p> | |
| Scruggs | Todd | 131. | The Tunnels violate the law because they do not comply with Water Code section 85045. It is best if comments can say "violate the law" or "violate water code § 85045." | This comment is about Water Code section 85045. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Seyer | Shellie | 132. | I am a resident of Discovery Bay, California. I am VERY concerned that Governor Brown's tunnel project will ruin our town, and drastically affect the lives of thousands of people in and around this area. I moved to this town to enjoy the Delta. Many others depend on the fresh Delta water for farming, recreational activities, and even their livelihoods. There are many other ways to solve the water issue that are less expensive and have much less environmental impact. Again, this area and many surrounding communities would be devastated if this project is allowed to proceed. | This comment is about recreation, socioeconomic impacts, and agriculture. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Shehan | Jason | 133. | I'm writing to voice my disapproval of the barge unloading facilities on Twin Sloughs (North Victoria Canal and Woodward Canal) in the Discovery Bay area of the Delta. This slough is a major thoroughfare for those of us who spend our summer at the Delta in that area. Whether fishing, boating, wakeboarding, or waterskiing, this slough is used for ski boats and fishing boats alike to find flat calm water away from the large racing boats and yachts. It is the most direct route between Union Point and Discover Bay and allows boaters to find additional water to wakeboard on on our way to and from Discovery Bay on our way to our destination on the water. Building these barge unloading facilities and shutting down Twin Sloughs would be a major negative impact to the Delta waterways for boaters. People come from all over the state to the Delta, and this area in particular. Shutting this area down for construction, and then post construction 5mph zones would deter people from coming to Discovery Bay. There would be negative fiscal impacts within the town of Discovery Bay as home owners could potentially not want to live in this area due to annoyance of this change. Prospective owners in Discovery Bay would factor this in when looking to buy, Orwood resort would see a reduction of customers, as would Union Point. The Safeway on Hwy 4 just outside Discovery Bay sees tons of additional customers during the summer and overall, families would miss out on fun days spent with their children on this | This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |

| | | | | |
|------------|--------|------|---|---|
| | | | flat water slough. We would be forced to wakeboard on less waterway, which would clog up other sloughs with additional boats and make the water rougher due to increased traffic. An alternative location less impactful to boaters must be chosen. | |
| Skilling | Mark | 134. | <p>I take this opportunity to voice my objection the Twin Tunnels Project because it will have an irreversibly negative impact on the environment and economic well being of the Town of Discovery Bay. I have been a home owner in Discovery Bay since 1999. I currently reside at 1856 Starfish Court. I raised my two boys here, and I also started a real estate brokerage serving the community.</p> <p>The tunnels will disrupt the local ecosystem, displacing and killing wildlife. It will both “temporarily” and permanently ruin recreational use of the waterways in and around Discovery Bay due to the years of construction followed by the water quality changes. That will have a disastrous economic impact on home values and the local economy. It will personally cost me hundreds of thousands of dollars and mean lost millions to the community at large.</p> <p>The plan is not fair to Discovery Bay residents nor is it even handed. Putting aside the obvious inequities of the plan to the local folks and wildlife; the plan is not legal either. Among the illegal transgressions is the violation of several sections of the water code.</p> <p>Please take notice of this vehement objection to the Twin Tunnels Project and add it to the many others that you have undoubtedly received. I am at your disposal should you need further information or explanation.</p> | This comment is about recreation, terrestrial and aquatic resources, and socioeconomic impacts. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Smith | Ken | 135. | Please extend the comment day another 90 days | This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Snyder III | George | 136. | I recently bought my first home here in Discovery Bay California. I work really hard for this home. I pay all my taxes and spent everything I have to live here. I have chosen Discovery Bay as my home for many reasons. One is the recreational water usage here. It has been brought to my attention from my community that there are plans for water tunnels to be built for our southern desert parts of the state. These plans also have shown to break laws as well as disrupt the community I choose to call home. This is very unfair to my community as well as myself. Like I said I work very hard and pay a considerate share of taxes. I choose to live in this community built around water, I did not choose a southern desert area prone to droughts. Why is my tax dollars going towards ruining my valued investments to benefit others people's bad choices to live in a Southern California desert. Please | This comment is about recreation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |

| | | | | |
|---------------|------------------|------|--|---|
| | | | consider my views before moving forward on these horrible unlawful tunnels. | |
| Stuart | Becca | 137. | <p>Construction plan in Chapter 15 – Recreation of the EIR.</p> <p>Building tunnels near Discovery Bay, CA will severely deminish the economy during the summer; people come from all over to have fun on the delta. Taking this away is not only ruining the reason people Visit discovery bay but also why we live there.</p> <p>Stop the Tunnels</p> | This comment is about recreation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Switzer | Doug and Annette | 138. | We are residents of Discovery Bay. We have followed the politics behind the proposed tunnels and strongly oppose their construction. Salinity levels are already way too far up river and the tunnels would make the situation worse. We have invested our life’s savings in our retirement and we do not want to see property levels degraded. | This comment is about water quality and socioeconomic impacts. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Tabor | Sean | 139. | This route would kill the business and marinas up river. Not only would people suffer but the environment as well. | This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Teyler Family | | 140. | I see that you have limit3ed the comment time to 30 days for the Delta Tunnel Project, which ends on January 22, 2017. This is an unreasonably short time to study the new information. I am asking that the period be increased from 30 days to 90 days to allow comments. | This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. The comment does not raise any substantive new information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/S |
| Tippery | Cecily | 141. | <p>Re: Twin Sloughs, close Connection Slough, and the primary anchorage in the South Delta, Mildred Island:</p> <p>I cannot believe that no one is listening. Our government is out of control and just doing willy-nilly as they want with no consideration for the environment or the people who actually live and travel the Delta Waterways. As a real estate agent and a person who is becoming more aware of environmental issues, any sort of movement to reduce water flow or change the normal structure of the Delta is abhorrent. We love the calm and peace we experience every time we “go out” and just float in our boat, listening to the wind and the waves quietly slap against the hull. This will all be gone if the proposed changes are made with the Tunnels, Twin Slough, Connection Slough and Mildred Island.</p> <p>As an agent representing buyers and Sellers in Discovery Bay where there are over 12000 residents and I would guess over 4000 personal watercraft as well as large boats that use the Delta, eliminating rafting out areas as well as ski access would cripple the market and reduce property values significantly, thereby reducing tax base, destroying our culture and livelihood.</p> | This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |

| | | | | |
|----------|------------------|------|---|--|
| | | | LISTEN to us for once, we do not want any deterioration or construction in the Delta waterways. | |
| Treadway | Carol and George | 142. | This is an outrage that we have only 30 days to respond. What are you people thinking. Please allow us at least an additional 60 days to review and respond!!!! | This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Vassar | William | 143. | I have lived in Discovery Bay since 2002, I like most residents enjoy boating on the Delta, if you take away the anchorage at Mildred Island and the Twin Slough ski area, you be seriously destroying the life style we are accustom to, I work year around don't get a vacation to fly somewhere tropical and enjoy, my enjoyment come from an overnight at Mildred or just a quick ski run on Twin Slough, not to say what you will be doing to wildlife and our house prices, don't wreck our Delta by taking these sights from us! | This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Vassar | William G. | 144. | <p>Please extend the 30 day review period to 90 days:</p> <p>1) They failed to recirculate the Draft EIR/S after it received a failing grade from USEPA. Under the law they are required to fix the problems and recirculate a draft EIR for further public comment when that happens. So they are using this final 30 day comment period to substitute for that required recirculation which should have been a long time ago and allowed for a much longer comment period. Because of this they should allow at least 90 days and hold a public hearing now.</p> <p>2) They failed to adequately respond to comments.</p> <p>3) They failed to consider an adequate range of alternatives because they did not consider any alternative with a storage element or any other portfolio element.</p> <p>4) They failed to comply with the Delta Reform Act because the preferred alternative does not reduce reliance on the Delta.</p> <p>These are all major substantive failures and 30 days is not enough time to adequately address these issues in comments so we need at least 90 days to prepare comments so the comment period should be extended.</p> <p>Item #2 above would be even better if you add one of your comments and their response that didn't answer you adequately.</p> | This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Vassar | William G. | 145. | I have lived in Discovery Bay since 2002, I like most residents enjoy boating on the Delta, if you take away the anchorage at Mildred Island and the Twin Slough ski area, you b seriously destroying the life style | This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental |

| | | | | |
|---------|--------|------|---|---|
| | | | we are accustom to, I work year around don't get a vacation to fly somewhere tropical and enjoy, my enjoyment come from an overnight at Mildred or just a quick ski run on Twin Slough, not to say what you will be doing to wildlife and our house prices, don't wreck our Delta by taking these sights from us! | information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Vinyard | Susan | 146. | It has come to our attention that the review period for the Delta Tunnel project is currently only 30 days. We are requesting you extend the period to 90 days. Thank you for keeping the public's interest in mind as you prepare for a very expensive use of taxpayer monies. | This comment is requesting an extension to the 30 day review period. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Wilson | Nicole | 147. | In regards to the proposed tunneling on the CA Delta, specifically on Twin Sloughs, this action will drastically effect the town of Discovery Bay and surrounding cities. The barge placement on Twin Sloughs ruins a local favorite for water sports and cuts access to restaurants, boat launches, and gas docks. I speak for every single resident of Discovery Bay, Brentwood, Oakley, Antioch, Tracy, Bethel Island....and ALL visitors of our Deltas waterways, PICK A DIFFERENT SPOT. | [Comment received after the end of 30-day NEPA review period on January 30, 2017] This comment is about recreation, specifically boat navigation. This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |
| Wyeth | Teresa | 148. | I live in Rio Vista in the beautiful California Delta. It's a true gem in our state. I fear the tunnels will destroy it, all in the name of helping a handful of agribusiness corporations. The 30 day review period for the Delta Tunnels report is much to short to do an adequate review. It will be impossible to have a accurate understanding of the risks associated with this massive project. I want to have faith in our state government, but this obvious attempt to ram this report through concerns me. | This comment is about socioeconomic impacts This comment does not raise any substantive new environmental information or analysis that was not previously addressed in the Final EIR/EIS. |